

EDINBURGH .

PRINTED BY T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY .

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

Y 94
/ 80

MAY—AUGUST 1849.

VOL. XI.

EDINBURGH :
W. P. KENNEDY, SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET ;
LONDON : HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO. ;
DUBLIN : JAMES M'GLASHAN.

MDCCCXLIX.

Uttarpore Jai Krishna Public Library
Acqn. No. 5455 Date 28.12.74

CONTENTS OF N^o XXII.

ART.	PAGE
I. The Philosophy of Religion. By J. D. Morell, A.M. London, 1849.	293
II. The Closing Years of Dean Swift's Life; with an Appendix containing several of his Poems hitherto unpublished, and some Remarks on Stella. By W. R. Wilde, M.R.I.A., &c. 1849.	337
III. Restauration des Sciences Philosophiques. Introduction à l'Etude de la Philosophie. Par Vincent Gioberti. In 3 vols. Paris.	369
IV. 1. Stein.—Sozialismus in Frankreich. 2. Fröbel.—System der Sozialen Politik. 3. Grün.—Die Soziale Bewegung in Frankreich und Belgien. 4. Bruno Bauer.—Die Bürgerliche Revolution in Deutschland seit dem Anfang der deutsch-catholischen Bewegung bis zur Gegenwart.	406
V. The Ten Years' Conflict: Being the History of the Disruption of the Church of Scotland. By Robert Buchanan, D.D. In Two Volumes. 1849.	436
VI. 1. First Report from the Select Committee on the Slave Trade. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 18th April 1848. 2. Second do. do. 30th May 1848. 3. Third do. do. 25th July 1848. . 4. Fourth do. do. 10th August 1848.	

AUT.

PAGE

VI.—*continued.*

5. First Report from the Select Committee on the Slave Trade. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 24th May 1849.
6. Second do. do. 21st June 1849. 457

- VII. 1. Emilia Wyndham. London.
2. Jane Eyre. London.
3. Fanny Hervey. London. 475

- VIII. 1. Narrative of the United States' Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea. By W. F. Lynch, U.S.N., Commander of the Expedition With Maps and numerous Illustrations. London, 1849.
2. Narrative of an Expedition to the Dead Sea. From a Diary, by one John Pasty. Edited by Edward P. Montague, attached to the United States' Expedition Ship "Supply." Philadelphia, 1849. 494

- IX. 1. Eastern Europe and the Emperor Nicholas. By the Author of "Revelations of Russia," &c. 2 vols. London, 1846.
2. Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature des Slaves. Par F. G. Eichhoff. Paris, 1839.
3. Dalmatia and Montenegro; with a Journey to Mostar in Herzegovina, and Remarks on the Slavonic Nations. By Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, F.R.S. 2 vols. London, 1848.
4. Panславism and Germanism. By Count Valerian Krasinski. London, 1848.
5. Der Krieg in Ungarn; mit einer Geschichte der Serbischen und Croatischen Wirren. Von Oskar Fodul. Mannheim, 1849. 528

- X. 1. The Railways of the United Kingdom Statistically considered, in relation to their Extent, Capital, Amalgamation, Debentures, Financial Position, Acts of Parliament by which Regulated, Creation and Appropriation of Shares, Calls, Dividends, &c., concisely arranged, from Authentic Documents. By Harry Scrivenor, Secretary to the Liverpool Stock Exchange. London, 1849. 8vo. Pp. 840.
2. The Railways of Great Britain and Ireland Practically Described and Illustrated. By Francis Whishaw, Civil Engineer, Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. London, 1840. 4to. Pp. 574. With Seventeen Plates.

ART.

PAGE

X.—*continued.*

3. An Historical and Practical Treatise upon Elemental Locomotion by means of Steam Carriages on Common Roads. By Alexander Gordon, Civil Engineer. London, 1833. 8vo. Pp. 192.
4. Past and Present Views of Railways. By Alexander Gordon, Esq., Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. London, 1849. Pp. 20.
5. Stokers and Pokers, or the London and North-Western Railway, the Electric Telegraph, and the Railway Clearing House. By the Author of Bubbles from the Brunnen of Nassau. Published in Murray's Colonial Library, No. 66. Pp. 208.
6. Report of the Commissioners of Railways, 1848. Part I. London, 1848. Pp. 224.
7. Report of the Commissioners of Railways, 1848. Part II. London, 1849. Pp. 220. 569

- XI. 1. Papers relating to the Articles of Agreement concluded between the British Government and the Lahore Durbar, on 16th December 1846, for the Administration of the Lahore State during the Minority of the Maharajah Dhulleep Singh. 1847.
2. Papers relating to the Punjab. 1847-1849. 618

TERPAP

BC=

1859

THE

NORTH-BRITISH REVIEW.

AUGUST, 1849.

ART. I.—*The Philosophy of Religion.* By J. D. MORELL, A.M.
London, 1849.

OUR chief object, in this continuation of our former Article, is to deal with Mr. Morell's views on Systematic Theology. This is an entirely different theme from that which has hitherto occupied us—as different as is the result or product, in any work, from the means and materials, or the laws and principles, of its construction. The philosophical adjustment of the *organum*, in the science of religion, is distinct from the philosophical use of that *organum*, when adjusted; although the former, of course, must always influence, and may often determine, the latter. In the present instance, Mr. Morell's theory of Revelation very decidedly modifies, or rather makes, his system of Theology,—if system it may be called which boasts of having none; and his whole scheme of reflective Christianity and its doctrinal development is involved, in its seed or germ, in his peculiar idea of the character and authority of Scripture.

In this connexion, we do not attach much importance to his chapter on Inspiration, although we must briefly notice it before proceeding to the remaining portion of his volume. Of that chapter we must be allowed to say plainly, that there are many things in it which, on his own account, we wish Mr. Morell had reconsidered before he gave them to the world, and which appear to us altogether unworthy of him. We regret, for instance, a certain asperity of tone,* and still more, great unfairness in stating the views of his opponents. This, we observe, he never once does in their own words; nor does he even once

* In one place (p. 178) he even loses temper so far as almost to swear; not indeed "a good mouth-filling oath," such as Hotspur calls for, but one of the sort he would have his lady "leave to velvet-guards and Sunday-citizens."

refer to any defender of the doctrine of plenary inspiration more recent than "Gerhard and the Buxtorfs," whom he names apparently for the pleasure of telling his readers that they "went so far as to affirm the inspired authority even of the vowel points." (P. 188.) We question if Mr. Morell has read any really competent treatise on the subject, especially any of those that have been composed with the advantage of the light which modern critical science has shed on it. We do not recognise any of the descriptions he has given of what is ordinarily meant by plenary or verbal inspiration; they are not even caricatures; they are simply distortions. The very epithet "mechanical," by which he distinguishes it throughout, shows that he does not understand it. Where did he find it identified with the power of working miracles? What right has he to charge its defenders with making the "dictation" of the words of Scripture "distinct from the religious enlightenment of the writers," so as to reduce them to mere "tools,"—or, in the language which he quotes with approbation, and we repeat in sadness, from Archdeacon Hare's *Mission of the Comforter*,—"drawers wherein the Holy Ghost put such and such things," whose "reciency with reference to the Spirit inspiring them was like that of a letter-box?" (Pp. 154, 156, 192.) Has any intelligent advocate of the view in question made it rest on each book having, as it was written, what Mr. Morell calls a "distinct commission,"—"a specific impress of Deity on it,"—a "specific Divine ordination,"—such as he sets himself to refute by a very needless and irrelevant display of superficial information on the history of the Canon of Scripture? We suspect that John Sterling, and John Sterling's Biographer, with Coleridge's "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," and, at the best, a note of Dr. Pyc Smith's, are the sources from which he has got his notions of the theory he so vehemently opposes; and, at all events, we beg to tell him, that it is a wooden Soldan he has been fighting all the time; his victory may be easy, but it is worthless.

On this account, we feel ourselves discharged from the obligation of following Mr. Morell through his remarks on Inspiration; the rather because we would reserve our discussion of the subject for ampler space than we can now afford; and Mr. Morell must excuse us if we add,—for a more candid and intelligent chapter on which to fasten our observations. We are very well aware of the gigantic importance of the subject. We have Dr. Arnold's pregnant sentence before us, in which he writes to Coleridge's nephew of his uncle's anticipated book.* Substantially we agree

* "Have you seen your uncle's 'Letters on Inspiration,' which I believe are to be published! They are well fitted to break ground in the approaches to that

with Dr. Arnold in his foresight of a religious crisis turning on this question; and we admit, moreover, that a philosophy of Inspiration, on the principle of its being plenary or verbal, is urgently called for. But Mr. Morell assuredly has not given us a philosophy of Inspiration on that or any other principle; and therefore we hold ourselves quite free to suspend our attempt either to criticise another, or to do the work ourselves.

Let us not, however, be misunderstood here. We have no expectation of any new discovery in this department of theological or biblical science; nor have we any leaning towards new interpretations of what are commonly regarded as the proof passages upon the subject. That holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,—that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,—that the Holy Ghost spake by the mouth of Isaiah the prophet,—that God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets since the world began,—these and the like formulæ, of so frequent occurrence in the word of God, we take, in their plain and full literal significance, as expressive of a fact which, explain it as we may, we are to receive upon the testimony of God himself,—that the entire authorship of the Bible is, in the strictest sense, to be ascribed to Him. What we chiefly desiderate is a fair and competent adjustment of the state of the question (*status quaestionis*); for it has been not a little complicated both by friends and by foes. The injudicious attempt, for instance, of some defenders of the doctrine, such as the late Dr. Dick and others, to distinguish the kinds or degrees of inspiration which they think they can recognise in the Scriptures,—ranging between mere oversight and actual, direct, verbal suggestion,—has led to the confounding of two wholly distinct questions; the one, as to the mode of the Spirit's operation on the persons inspired; the other, as to the fact of the inspiration itself. How God dealt with the agents whom he employed for communicating his will to man,—whether or not he always dealt with them in precisely the same way,—and if not, what may have been his various ways of dealing with them, so as in all instances to secure the accurate utterance, or the accurate recording, of what he wished to have communicated—are inquiries of deep interest, no doubt, but not immediately affecting the warrant we have for believing that what they have said or written,—whatever may have been the dealings of God with them of which it is the result or product,—is yet itself really not

momentous question which involves in it so great a shock to existing notions; the greatest, probably, that has ever been given since the discovery of the falsehood of the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. Yet it must come, and will end, in spite of the fears and clamours of the weak and bigoted, in the higher exalting and more sure establishing of Christian truth." We need scarcely say that this refers to the posthumous work published as "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit."

merely their word, but God's word through them to us. On the other hand, not a few have stumbled at the plain proofs all Scripture affords of human faculties and feelings having been concerned in the composition of every line of it, as if the theory of plenary inspiration went to the entire annihilation of the personality of the sacred writers, and precluded any manifestation of that personality. The real fact is, the Bible is a book written by men, for men: and were it not so, it would lose all its charm, and half its power. If the writers, at any time, had ceased to think and feel as men themselves, and to have the sympathy of human thought and feeling with their readers or hearers, they could not have served the purpose of Him who used them. It was not a trumpet, a voice, a pen, a hand, that He employed to serve his purpose; but minds, souls, hearts. To say, however, that he could not secure as certain a sound through these living agents as through dead instruments, is surely to limit God unworthily.

But we forbear. For besides what we have already hinted as to his misstatement of the question, we have another reason for thinking it unnecessary to grapple with Mr. Morell, here, in detail. He has disqualified himself by his previous Theory of Revelation for any separate discussion of the question of Inspiration: the one chapter is merely a corollary or appendix to the other. He reasons upon Inspiration entirely *a priori*. He assumes, generally, that God's Revelation of his mind and will must be essentially a subjective process of illumination in the intuitional consciousness; then he finds that this process may admit of or require both the application of certain means and influences from without, and a direct and immediate operation upon and within the mind: and restricting the name of Revelation Proper to the first, he is willing to hand over the latter to the category of Inspiration.

Now, in one respect, we most heartily rejoice in this. We hail it as an express acknowledgment that something more than means and influences is needed to awaken the intuitional consciousness to a right grasp of God and things Divine; and in the beginning and end of this chapter, we find passages of great beauty, which, were the subject of them individual conversion, might be quoted with entire approbation. For they very clearly assert the necessity of a subjective regeneration and renewal, as well as of an objective application, whether of the truth, or of the manifold instrumentalities in which the truth is embodied and conveyed.

But this is really not the question. The Inspiration about which we are concerned, respects not the reception, but the communication of the mind and will of God: it is not how "holy

men of old" conceived, but how they "spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter i. 21.) That many difficulties are connected with the theory, rationale, or philosophy of this inspiration, we frankly admit; and we are not prepared to deny that there may be room for differences of opinion as to the manner, consistently with a belief of the fact. How their being moved by the Holy Ghost stood related to their speaking, not as machines, but as living men,—what securities were afforded against the confounding of their own impulses with the Spirit's movements,—whether these movements were occasional or constant,—how far they always carried along with them the full intelligence of the persons subjected to them, especially when they related to future events and their issues,—what provision may have been made in the case of those thus speaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, for the words infallibly conveying the movements,—the pen recording the words,—and the record being discriminated from other documents, and reaching more or less safely future generations,—these are all inquiries of deep interest into which we are quite ready to plunge, if it be once frankly admitted that "holy men of old" did "speak as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" and that we have, on the whole, an authentic transcript of what they so spoke; or, in other words, that "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past to the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his own Son." (Heb. i. 1.)

But we positively must deny Mr. Morell's right and competency as a challenger or champion on this field. And, in vindication of our declinature, we quote a single passage, in which, after giving three arguments against Plenary or Verbal Inspiration, all of them either irrelevant, or founded upon misunderstandings, he thus produces his fourth and last.

"Fourthly. The *positive* evidence against this theory—evidence which to a thoughtful mind amounts to a moral demonstration—lies here: that even if we suppose the letter of the Scripture to have been actually dictated, yet that *alone* would never have served as a revelation of Christianity to mankind, or obviated the necessity of an appeal from the letter to the spirit of the whole system. A revelation, we have shown, necessarily implies a direct intuition of Divine things. The revelation of Christianity was made to man by a continued and specially designed process of influences and agencies. The types of Judaism, the person and history of the Saviour, the effusion of the Spirit, the life, labours, and teaching of the Apostles,—all these conspired to *reveal* Christianity to the human mind. The penning of the sacred records was indeed *one* out of the many efforts they made to unfold the will of God to man; but these records, without the moral and spiritual life awakened in the souls of the converts, would have conveyed but dim and imperfect notions of the truth itself. And so

it is *now*,—the letter of the Scripture has to be illumined by the Spirit of Truth before it affords to any one a full manifestation of Christianity in its essence and its power; while in proportion to the varied spiritual condition of the reader, the conceptions attached to the mere words are almost infinitely diversified."

There is surely great confusion here. First, there is a confusion between what is necessary to constitute a revelation to man, and what is necessary to secure a right understanding of the revelation by man. Next, and quite subordinate to the first, there is a confusion between the "efforts" the writers of the Bible, as inspired men, may have "made to unfold the will of God to man," and the actual unfolding of it, which we have in their literary remains. And, thirdly, we have a confusion between what they had to do as channels of revelation, and what we have to do as recipients of it. It is not at all to the purpose to say, that "*now* the letter of Scripture has to be illumined by the Spirit of Truth, before it affords to any one a full manifestation of Christianity;" not more now, however, than always; for the inspired utterers of prophecy themselves had to "search what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them, did signify when it testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow;" (1 Peter i. 11;) and our Lord has expressly declared, that to be least in the kingdom of heaven—least evidently as recipient of its truth in the spirit of a little child—is to be greater than the greatest of prophets. (Matt. xi. 11; xviii. 3, 4.) Does not this imply that these two processes are wholly distinct,—the communication of the will of God by the prophet, and the reception of it by the little child? It is surely great confusion to mix them up together, and to identify the attitude, say of the Baptist, as a revealer of the Divine will authoritatively to others, with the attitude of the same man, perhaps, the Baptist, as a meek and child-like recipient of that will for the saving of his own soul. (John iii. 25, 26.) Are not these two processes distinct? And is it not an abuse of language to employ the term Inspiration as equally applicable to both?

Nor is it any argument to say, that because even if dictated by God, the Scripture cannot be spiritually understood by any one, without an inward illumination of the Spirit of truth in his own mind and heart; therefore the Scripture is not, and cannot be so dictated. And yet this is exactly the argument of Mr. Morell. He may reply, perhaps, that his reasoning turns upon the question of *cui bono*? Of what use is such a divine dictation of Scripture, if after all, and with all the benefit of it, every one individually must undergo for himself a process of inward spiritual enlightenment before the Scripture can be to him person-

ally an intelligible and profitable revelation? To what purpose is the dictation? What is the advantage of contending for it? With submission, however, we say that is not the point. We have to deal first with a question of fact; and, secondly, with its philosophy. Have the Sacred Writers actually enjoyed the Divine aid? And have they been under the Divine superintendence and control, not in conceiving for themselves merely, but in communicating to others, whether in history, prophecy, psalms, epistles, doctrinal treatises, or otherwise, the truths concerning God and his dealings with mankind, which God would have us to receive, both into our logical and intuitional consciousness,—which, in other words, he would have us to know, understand, and believe? And if so, of what nature and of what value has the Divine oversight been? To what extent has it been such as to secure the infallible correctness and accuracy of the writings we now possess, as faithful transcripts of the Divine mind? These, as it seems to us, are the questions which the “*Philosophy of Inspiration*” should embrace; and it will not do to set these questions aside on the mere ground, that, after all, over and above this whole process of verbal communication to us on the part of God, there must still be an inward spiritual illumination before we can spiritually discern what he thus communicates to us respecting himself, his character, and his will,—the “*deep things*” of his law, and judgment, and grace, and salvation,—the vast realities of the eternal world.

Mr. Morell emphatically declares, that “*to speak of logic, as such, being inspired, is a sheer absurdity.*” (P. 173.) Why so? Because no “*amount of inspiration can affect the formal laws of thought.*” Who ever said it could? But is it therefore impossible for the Supreme Being to reason logically with his intelligent creatures? or to employ, and infallibly direct one of his intelligent creatures in reasoning on his behalf with others? We presume to think that God, if he saw cause, could demonstrate to us, by words and signs, the propositions of the first Book of Euclid; or, he could take a clown from his plough, and use him as an instrument, with more or less intelligence of his own, in demonstrating them—himself taking care to see that the demonstration was accurate. Will Mr. Morell’s short formula apply here,—“*to speak of mathematics, as such, being inspired, is a sheer absurdity?*” Nor will it do to reply, that the mathematical science is intuitional, and that the inspiration here might be in the clown’s intuitions. We suppose that God might possibly take the oversight of the man’s mind, in reasoning out the propositions, and writing down his reasonings for the benefit of others, so as to make them virtually and really his own reasonings, and, as such, infallibly correct. We suppose that this is

possible; at least the impossibility of it is not proved by Mr. Morell's axiomatic announcement. Mr. Morell very unphilosophically confounds two things,—the organ (*organum*), so to speak, employed by one mind in communicating with another, and the act of communicating by means of, or in the use of, that organ. Mr. Morell's apothegm would go to prove, that I cannot convey my mind to him, nor he his to me, by a process of logical reasoning; for neither my mind, nor his, can alter the laws of thought. To speak, therefore, of logic, as such,* being inspired by my mind, in communicating with him, or by his in communicating with me, is a "sheer absurdity." True; but we venture to think, that the use of it, by myself and by him respectively, might, and would be inspired by our respective minds; and that the written product would be my reasoning with him, or his with me. May not our Maker then, in like manner, reason with both of us? Or may he not, by his Spirit, move Paul to reason with us on his behalf; and so watchfully and effectually guide Paul in the work as to ensure that the record of the reasoning shall be precisely such as he himself would have it to be?

There is much in this chapter which we have already touched on, by anticipation, in our previous remarks, and not a little which our sincere respect for Mr. Morell's candour would incline us not to touch on at all. Mr. Morell ought to be above the artifice of embarrassing the argument by the very easy and commonplace mode of accumulating the admitted difficulties of the subject, and evading its essential merits. He has addressed himself, too much after the manner of certain enemies of the Bible with whom we would be the last to associate him, to the vulgar and ignorant understanding, that can easily relish a sly hit, and seize a pithily put objection, but will not take the trouble necessary for arriving at the right explanation. He has sometimes overdone this sort of work. Thus, Peter's fault at Antioch, (Gal. ii. 11-21,)—his unwarrantable compromise of the faith and liberty of Gentile converts in the matter of circumcision, is a favourite text of our author. Three times at least we have noted his reference to it;—with what good taste, to say the least, we shall not offer our opinion. But we must be allowed to quote one instance. Arguing against what he calls the "verbal dictation" of the Bible on the ground that it would demand "a two-fold kind of inspiration," he thus proceeds:

"The apostles, it is admitted, were inspired to preach and to teach orally; but we have the most positive evidence that this commission did not extend to their very words. Often they were involved in minor misconceptions; and sometimes they taught specific notions inconsistent with a pure spiritual Christianity, as Peter did when he was rebuked by Paul. The verbal scheme, therefore, demands the

admission of *one* kind of inspiration having been given to the apostles as men, thinkers, moral agents, and preachers, and another kind having been granted them as *writers*."—P. 155.

This is very odd reasoning. How does Peter's "teaching a specific notion inconsistent with a pure spiritual Christianity," granting this to have been his error, prove that "the commission of the apostles did not extend to their very words?" We presume that in this instance Peter's commission did not extend to his "notion" any more than to his "words." The incident may raise a difficult question; whether the apostles were inspired in all that they said and did? and if not, how we are to discriminate between their authorized and unauthorized proceedings? But it has no bearing whatever on the nature of inspiration itself; unless, indeed, Mr. Morell means to infer that because they were not always infallibly guided aright in their conduct and ministry, they were never infallibly guided aright at all. But this is inconsistent with his admission that "they were inspired to preach and to teach *orally*," at least if that admission is made in good faith, and with a definite meaning.

This, we are sorry to say, we feel ourselves forced to doubt. At all events we must ask, in what sense were they "inspired to preach and to teach *orally*?" We say, of course, in the very same sense in which they were inspired to write their books. Is this Mr. Morell's opinion? Then to what purpose is his distinction between their being "inspired to preach and teach *orally*," and their "commission not extending to their very words?" Plainly, in the case he quotes, the commission did not extend to the notion any more than to the words, in the sense of infallibly securing truth and accuracy; and if Peter's weak compliance with Jewish prejudice is relevant at all in this inquiry, which we utterly deny, it tells not against "verbal dictation" as distinct from the inspiration of "*oral* preaching and teaching," but against any infallible guidance whatever having been granted to the apostles either in speaking or in writing.

We would like to know how Mr. Morell deals with the express predictions recorded in the Bible—predictions confessedly only partially understood by the prophets themselves,*—as well as with the messages introduced by the formula, Thus saith the Lord? Surely he will admit something like verbal dictation in instances

* 1 Peter i. 10, 11—"Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." This text is not quite in accordance with Mr. Morell's statement respecting the prophets, that we have no "reason to regard their writings as inspired in any other sense than as being the transcript of their inward prophetic consciousness."—(Pp. 162, 163.)

like these. And for the purpose of an argument on the philosophy of inspiration, these are the instances which Mr. Morell ought fairly to meet. It is an obvious and easy evasion to enlarge in a popular way on the difficulties respecting "Scripture morality," Scripture science, "minor discrepancies," the formation of the canon, the miscellaneous nature of its contents, and other ready topics likely to occur to every superficial thinker,—difficulties which all intelligent defenders of plenary inspiration acknowledge, and which, prepared as they are to meet them in detail, they hold to be overborne by the Divine testimony asserting the inspiration of Scripture as a whole. The essential question, however, in a philosophical point of view, is sufficiently raised by a single example; and if there be but a single sentence in all the Bible, uttered or recorded by any one of its writers under infallible Divine guidance, that guidance reaching to the expression as well as the thought, we have a phenomenon which, let him make what he pleases of all the rest, Mr. Morell as a religious philosopher is bound to recognise. If he deny that there is any such sentence at all, he ought to know that he goes greatly beyond the mere rejection of the theory of verbal inspiration, and that in fact he questions the possibility of God holding any communication by means of language with any of his intelligent creatures on the earth.

Obviously we cannot discuss this subject now; but we are reluctant to leave it without a brief attempt at least to state the case. Let it be assumed that God meant to compose a book, such as should at once bear the stamp of his own infallible authority, and have enough of human interest to carry our sympathies along with it. He may accomplish this by a miracle in a moment; the book may drop suddenly complete from heaven; and sufficient proofs and signs may attest the fact. Even in that case, unless the miracle be perpetual, the book once launched has the usual hazards of time and chance to run in the world; in the process of endless copying and printing it is liable to the usual literary accidents; and in the course of centuries, sundry points of criticism emerge regarding it. But instead of thus issuing the volume at once and entire from above, its Divine author chooses to compile it more gradually on the earth, and he chooses also to avail himself of the command he has of the mind and tongue and pen of every man that lives. He selects, accordingly, chosen men from age to age. These he does not turn into machines; they continue to be men. They speak and write according to their individual tastes and temperaments, in all the various departments of literary composition: the prince, the peasant, the publican, the learned scribe, the unlettered child of toil, one skilled in all the wisdom of Egypt, another bred

among the herdmen of Tekoa,—men, too, of all variety of natural endowments, the rapt poet, the ripe scholar, the keen reasoner, the rude annalist and bare chronicler of events, the dry and tedious compiler, if you will,—all are enlisted in the service, and the Divine Spirit undertakes so to penetrate their minds and hearts, and so to guide them in the very utterance and recording of their sentiments, as to make what they say and write, when under his inspiration, the word of God, in a sense not less exact than if, with his own finger, he had graven it on the sides of the everlasting hills. Many questions, doubtless, will arise to exercise the skill and tact of readers, and put their intelligence and good faith to the test; for it is to intelligence and good faith that this volume of miscellanies is committed. In the case of any author writing in various kinds of composition, it often becomes a nice point of criticism how far and in what way he is to be held as giving any opinion of his own; as for example, when he narrates the speeches and actions of others, or when in an abrupt play of argumentative wit he mixes up the adversary's pleas with his own, or when he uses parables and figures, or when he adapts himself to the state of information and measure of aptitude to learn among those for whom he writes, or when he writes in different characters and for different ends. On the principle of plenary inspiration, it is of course assumed that the same sagacity and good sense will be applied to such various works of which God is thus the author, that we do not grudge in a case of voluminous and versatile human authorship; and it is confessed that the whole inquiry regarding the books to be included in the collected edition of the works, the purity and accuracy of the text, and the rules of sound literal interpretation, falls within the province of the uninspired understanding of mankind, and must be disposed of according to the light which the testimony of the Church, the literary history of the canon, and other sources of information, may be found to afford. But what then? Does this detract from the value of our having an infallible communication from the Divine mind, somewhat fragmentary, if you will, and manifold, as having been made “at sundry times and in divers manners,” *πολυμερως και πολυτροπως*, but still conveying to us, on Divine authority, and with a Divine guarantee for its perfect accuracy, the knowledge of the character and ways of God, the history of redemption, the plan of salvation, the message of grace, and the hope of glory? Or does it hinder the assurance which, under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, a plain man may have, as the Scriptures enter into his mind, carrying their own light and evidence along with them, that he has God speaking to him as unequivocally as one friend speaks to another,—but with an authority all his own?

We had noted for remark several strange and significant modes of speech in this chapter on Inspiration; as when Mr. Morell speaks of inspiration "indicating an inward nature" . . . "simply recipient of the Divine ideas circumambient around it," "responsive in all its strings to the breath of heaven," (p. 151;) or again, when he proposes as the only "real and essential revelation," "the Spirit of Truth, interpreted by Divine aid, and perceived by the religious consciousness of true believers," (p. 158;) or once more, when he tells us that "this same Spirit," the Spirit of Christ possessed by the apostles, "was poured out without measure upon the Church," (p. 165;) whereas, in our simplicity, we have been accustomed to restrict such a possession of the Spirit,— "without measure,"— to Christ himself. (John iii. 34.) "Divine ideas circumambient around!" "the Spirit of Truth interpreted by Divine aid!" Mr. Morell must excuse us if we crave an explanation of these vague sublimities. We observe him also giving it as his opinion that "inspiration does not imply anything generically new in the actual processes of the human mind." (p. 151.) Perhaps not, if by "generically new" we understand anything like the imparting of new faculties of thought and speech, or the imposing on them of new laws. So again he says, "inspiration, *as an internal phenomenon*, is perfectly consistent with the natural laws of the human mind;" certainly it is so, but as if he were stating an identical proposition, he adds—"it is a higher potency of a certain form of consciousness which every man to some degree possesses," (p. 166;) which is altogether a different matter. In our view, it is a direct Divine action, in and upon the inspired person's natural faculties of thought and speech, and according to their natural laws, ensuring an infallibly correct utterance of what God designs to communicate through him to others. We might complain more seriously of the insinuation that things substantially immoral are "either justified or spoken of with indifference" in the Old Testament. (p. 168.) That men's evil actions and evil sayings, under an imperfect dispensation, are often recorded without remark, or without an express intimation of the Divine mind regarding them, is admitted. But this is manifestly according to the common analogy of God's providence, and is a fitting exercise of man's moral sense and sensibility. If anything more is alleged, the discussion must proceed upon particular instances, and not on a vague surmise. But we leave much in the chapter for the present untouched; having done little more than throw up a few hasty and slight defenses around a field demanding, doubtless, a far more leisurely survey before a general action can be fought, or a decisive victory can be won.

Entering now on the field of Theology Proper, we must attempt a survey of it, as laid down in Mr. Morell's map, before we offer any sketch of our own. For this purpose, we crave attention to a rapid summary of the argument as sustained in his chapter on Christian Theology, reserving the Analysis of Popular Theology and Fellowship for our closing remarks.

Let it be remembered, that hitherto we have nothing whatever allowed to be of the essence of Religion, except what is "spontaneous and intuitional;" or in other words, a frame of mind intuitively gazing upon Divine things, without the intervention of the logical understanding. It is true that "certain external influences and special providential arrangements" (p. 193) are admitted as having something to do with the phenomena of Revelation and Inspiration. But how? Not in the way of an authoritative conveyance or communication of explicit information from God to men, but simply in the way of a powerful influence upon men's minds, quickening their intuitional consciousness, and so enabling them to perceive for themselves, and intuitively grasp, spiritual realities. The Bible is not a revelation of God's will to mankind at large; the idea of God, by a single utterance, or succession of utterances, revealing his mind to a multitude at once, or to men in the mass, is not a part of Mr. Morell's philosophy; all that, according to him, God can do, is to reveal his mind to men in detail, one by one; and that not by speaking as a man might speak to his friend, but merely by a subjective operation, through whatever means, on the intuitional consciousness, imparting spiritual discernment.

Now the problem is,—given such data in the intuitional experiences, which alone are the essential elements of Religion,—to construct a logical science of Theology. Thus stated, the problem is identical in kind with what needs to be solved in constructing a science of beauty, or of sublimity, or of virtue,—of any branch, in short, of man's aesthetic or ethical constitution. In all such inquiries, relating to tastes or senses—and involving man's capacity of apprehending the fair, the good, the holy—we have given us, as the elements of the science to be constructed, certain original instincts or intuitions, along with certain historical developments of these, as affected by the external influences and arrangements to which, in fact, they have been exposed. Does Mr. Morell admit the materials of the science of Theology to be in any essential particular distinct from those of the other sciences to which we have referred? *

We have been accustomed to class Theology as one of an entirely different order of sciences. Setting aside abstract Logic and Mathematics,—as well as the aesthetic and ethical principles of taste and conscience,—we find a field of actual fact, ascertain-

able *a posteriori* by observation and experience, to which all these *a priori* laws of thought and feeling may and must be applied; as servants, however, and not as masters; interpreters and not creators. We refer, of course, to the physical sciences, as well as to the sciences of politics, political economy, and social morality in all its branches. In all these sciences, we have on the one hand a body of materials furnished by observation and experience, and on the other, certain original instincts or intuitions, moral, mathematical or sentimental, constituting the mould that shapes, and the spirit that inspires, the issues. Now we have been wont to class testimony, whether human or divine, among the sources of these materials: and hence, we have been apt to class Theology among the inductive sciences.

To make our meaning clear, let us take any class of what it is the fashion now to call the aesthetical emotions; let us take the sense of beauty, or the sense of sweet sounds and harmonious concords, and trace its development. First, we have the original intuition, as a first principle, incapable of definition or analysis. There is, then, an intuition of the beautiful. Let that intuition be quickened, and it becomes active,—creative. It seeks to express and embody itself in the construction of fair forms, or the picturing of bright ideas to the fancy; and the art of painting, or poetry, or sculpture, springs up. Thereafter, the reflex succeeding naturally to the direct, the critical reason or logical understanding takes the field, and the art speedily becomes a science. In the original intuition, or sense of beauty, the logical understanding has no part; and hence *de gustibus non disputandum*. But when the intuition, under the influence of external circumstances of time, place, scenery, society, and so forth, unfolds itself in actual results, these become tangible, palpable, historical; they may be analyzed, compared, experimented upon; and so they may become the materials of a logical science, more or less exact according to the measure of real development which the intuition has reached, and the comparative absence of disturbing influences and forces.

Not unlike this is Mr. Morell's account of Christian Theology, of which he professes to explain the Nature, Conditions, Method, Development and Uses. In its nature, according to him, Theology, being connected with the operation of the logical faculty, gives us knowledge that is representative, reflective, formal, critical and individual; and stands contrasted with Religion, which, resulting from the operation of the intuitional faculty, perceives its object directly and spontaneously; is possessed, therefore, of a material value; gives us truth in its unity; and bears upon it the stamp of a generic character, growing up in the moral development of communities and nations. (Pp. 197-200.) "The re-

ligious life consists entirely in emotion and intuition;" and there is "involved in it a certain spiritual truth," which it "presents to the mind of man in the concrete, and as a whole." Why and how this truth passes into the region of the logical understanding, let Mr. Morell himself explain:—

"Were the view we thus obtain perfectly clear and uniform, we should need nothing more. But Divine things, alas! are reflected upon the surface of our spiritual nature after it has been ruffled by distracting passions, prejudices, or cares; just as, when the bosom of a lake is fretted by the wind and the storm;—and thus the Divine symmetry of the objects presented is broken and lost to our view. It is then that the logical or analytic faculty comes to our aid, and seeks to restore to us the harmonious proportions of truth; not, indeed, by affording an immediate glance at the concrete whole, but by separating it into its parts, comparing one portion with another, and thus discovering, if possible, the consistency which runs through them all." —Pp. 196, 197.

This is, perhaps, the best place for adverting to Mr. Morell's view of the disorder or disease of our nature, and the bearing of it upon his construction of the Christian Theology. We need scarcely say that the subject on which we now touch lies at the very foundation of this whole inquiry, since upon the estimate we form of man's actual state and condition, our conception of the Divine manner of dealing with it must essentially depend. Christianity is a remedial dispensation; the Gospel is a curative system; Jesus announces himself as a physician. And it would seem that at the very threshold of every attempt to give a philosophy of the medicine, there must be an adequate recognition of the malady. A correct and deep pathology is the best preparation for a sound theory of therapeutics. On this account, we complain of it as a most serious omission or defect, even in a philosophical point of view, that Mr. Morell has not formally discussed the subject of the fall and its consequences, and has not given any clear and unequivocal exposition of human guilt and depravity. It may be an old fashioned prejudice with us: but we like to begin at the beginning; and especially when we find that the very system of means and influences we are to philosophize upon, bears on the face of it a certain character of relation and adaptation to a certain view of man's condition and nature as a sinner,—that it professes to be a restorative,—a specific,—a panacea—not indefinitely, as is the manner of empirics, for any or all sorts of ailments,—but for one specific kind of ill, which it singles out as the cause of whatever bad symptoms are perceptible,—we cannot but think it a want, at this stage of Mr. Morell's analysis,—a *desideratum*,—

a *hiatus valdè deflendus*,—that he has not expressly grappled with this preliminary investigation. Is man on a right footing with his Maker? If not, what is wrong? These are questions which even natural religion forces upon us; and still more, revealed Religion or Christianity. To evade these questions,—to dispose of them incidentally and, as it were, by the bye,—to treat them otherwise than as primary and fundamental questions,—to decline an explicit and categorical reply to them,—we hesitate not to denounce as unphilosophical. We demand from Mr. Morell a chapter on this topic. We do so on a double ground. He cannot complete his exposition of man's natural constitution as a religious being,—capable of religious intuitions and emotions,—without taking up the topic. And he cannot commence his exposition of God's revealed will for man's salvation, without, one way or other, disposing of it. Natural religion cannot end,—revealed Religion cannot begin,—without the questions we have now indicated being raised and settled;—Is man on a right footing with his Maker? and if not, what is wrong? And we repeat it, we are speaking not now as Theologians, but as students of the Philosophy of Religion.

Are we, for instance, to recognise as among the actual facts of man's condition, guilt, demerit, condemnation, liability to judgment? Is man a breaker of the law,—a rebel against the government of God? Is he an outcast from the favour of God, under his displeasure, subject to a judicial and penal sentence of separation from his love? Is this the true account of man's position as a moral, religious, and responsible being, and the real explanation of all the disorder into which his spiritual nature has fallen,—of whatever darkness clouds his mind, and whatever blight withers the affections of his heart? We are accustomed to consider this to be the right view of the case, sanctioned both by conscience and by Scripture. But we put it at present as a hypothesis. Well then, upon this hypothesis, what may, or rather must be the essential character of Christianity, as a remedial dispensation? Evidently, if it is to strike at the root of the evil, it must be primarily and chiefly an authoritative proclamation of forgiveness; and it may be expected to contain an explanation, on the part of the offended God, both of the principles upon which he acts, as the Lawgiver and Judge, in dispensing pardon, and of the terms on which he is prepared to admit offenders to the benefit of the pardon he dispenses,—or in other words, to reconcile sinners to himself. But who does not see, that if this be the nature of Christianity, it must necessarily, as a communication from heaven, address itself to the logical understanding, in the first instance, however much it may ultimately tax the intuitional and emotional parts of our constitution? For

there is a new, categorical, proposition to be announced,—namely, that God is willing to pardon; and there are distinct discoveries to be made of the reason why, and the manner how, he pardons; with all which it is as plainly the province of the logical reason to deal, as with any statement of fact, or any explanation of circumstances, a man may make to his friend. So that on the supposition now before us, the order of Mr. Morell's analysis of Christian Theology is exactly reversed; it is seen to be directly an appeal to the logical understanding, and only indirectly, through the logical understanding, an object of intuition at all; and thus the whole structure of this philosophy of feeling and fellowship, as opposed to faith, falls utterly to the ground.

Mr. Morell must not here misunderstand us. We do not blame him for not adopting the view of man's condition, as a fallen being, we have been indicating, but for not discussing it. We wish to show, that whatever theory we may form on that subject, or whatever opinion we may hold, must materially modify our conception of Christian Theology. In particular, as to the real question at issue between us, everything turns upon that preliminary point. We admit that Christian Theology, subjectively considered, has its seat both in the intuitional and in the logical faculty: but we differ in the precedency we assign to the one over the other. Mr. Morell makes the intuitional prepare the way for the logical; we, on the other hand, insist upon the logical as prior to the intuitional; and what we now wish to point out is, that issue is to be joined upon this question between Mr. Morell and us, in that very field of man's position as a sinful and guilty creature which Mr. Morell has left unsurveyed. This is surely a great omission.

But we must press our author a little more closely. He is doubtless well acquainted with the controversy much agitated during the last century, as to Christianity being merely a republication of the religion of nature. The infidel writers holding that opinion were quite ready to admit the possibility, and even the reality of an objective revelation. God, according to them, may have spoken, and doubtless has often spoken to men, as a man speaks to his friend, or commissions a friend to speak for him. But they maintained that any information God might thus impart to man, could really be nothing more, and was nothing more, than man himself might have discovered, had he duly used his own faculties for acquiring a knowledge of God. Thus God might reveal the elements of Geometry, engraving the diagrams in the sand or on the rocks, and audibly demonstrating the propositions by a voice from heaven; but this would, after all, be nothing more than a clear, authentic, and authoritative republication of the geometry of nature. In some such way did these

sceptics conceive of the discoveries God had made in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

Now we do not wish to give offence: but we put it to Mr. Morell to say, if there is any room, on his principles, for Christianity being any thing more,—we do not say than a republication,—but than a revival,—“of the religion of nature.” We use the word revival advisedly, in preference to republication, as more in accordance with our author’s ideal both of Natural and of Revealed Religion. Religion, with him, is, in its essence, a pure exercise of the intuitional faculty; and Revelation is a Divine quickening of that faculty. This is really all that we can make of his somewhat vague and intangible investigation; and we submit that it effectually limits the function of the Gospel to the discovery of truth, which, but for the imperfection of the intuitional faculty and its need of Divine quickening, might be apprehended and perceived without the Gospel. To evade the force of this remark, it may be replied perhaps;—Oh! but Mr. Morell allows, and indeed maintains, that under Christian influences, men come into contact with new truths, which they could not otherwise have discerned:—they are lifted into a loftier region and clearer atmosphere, and endowed with a keener vision, so that, like Paul, rapt into the third heavens, they intuitively grasp things glorious and godlike, such as eye could not see nor tongue tell without this sublime illumination. Doubtless Mr. Morell admits all this. But then, let it be observed, whatever new discovery is thus made through the Gospel, must be merely a discovery of what exists and is true, independently of the Gospel, and apart from it. It cannot possibly be a discovery of anything new, in the sense of its being additional information given by God concerning himself and his ways, beyond what, without the Gospel, might be known. For if it were, it must of necessity be communicated, in verbal statements, through the logical understanding, precisely as one man communicates information to another; a mode of revelation which Mr. Morell studiously disowns.

We are anxious to make our meaning plain; and for this end, we try an illustration. Our natural eyesight is defective, in extent of range, as well as clearness, certainty, and intensity of vision. We may conceive of the eye undergoing a process of purging inwardly, and receiving aid from instruments and appliances externally,—being anointed with eyesalve and furnished with the almost miraculous power of mirrors, glasses, and telescopes unnumbered: and we can conceive of the beholder carried to a high mountain; the air all around him marvellously cleared; and the sun in the heavens shining with unprecedented lustre. He gazes around; it is a new world; things grand and

fair start for him into being for the first time, on every side; a revelation! he exclaims; a blessed, joyous, glorious revelation! Be it so. There is surely, however, a difference between this and the actual presentation to his view of a world really and literally new,—a strictly new scene, or a new creation. Let it be imagined, that besides all the preparation we have described, He who is the maker of the eye and instrument and atmosphere and world alike, brings a new order of things altogether into existence, places it within the circuit of the eye's rolling glance, and then purges the eye that it may see this new thing clearly, and see all things else in the light of it. Have we not, at all events, a different kind of revelation from the former? In the one case, we have an enlarging, an enhancing, an intensifying, if we may so speak, of the old vision of nature: in the other case, we have a vision absolutely new.

Now the Gospel, in our conception of it, is the discovery to us of a new thing in the government of God,—a new thing done by God in addition to all that the highest and most perfect intelligence could otherwise apprehend of him or of his works,—a thing so new and strange that it never could have entered into any heart to conceive of it,—a thing that never could have been known but by God himself telling it to us, and which he can tell us only as one man tells another what he is doing, by means of logic and language. No doubt, even when he tells it to us, by words addressed to our logical understanding, we cannot adequately or spiritually apprehend it, without a renovating Divine movement in every part of our intellectual and moral nature. Still, our belief is, not merely that he enables us to see in a new light what is old, but that he tells us something in itself new. For such belief, however, we fear, there is no room in Mr. Morell's Christian Theology. We cannot but think that his theory absolutely precludes any other view of the Gospel than this; that it gives us a brighter vision than we could otherwise have had of what God, from the very first, might have been seen by any competent intelligence to be; not that it unfolds to us any new work subsequently done, or any word spoken by God, for making known to us something concerning himself, which, without his own express information, no intelligence could ever have surmised.

And this brings us back to our complaint, that Mr. Morell leaves undiscussed the subject of man's natural condition, as a fallen being, in relation to God; and consequently leaves undetermined the character of the Gospel as a restorative economy—a remedial dispensation. Nor is this all we have to complain of. The little he says on human depravity is very far from being satisfactory. We have extracted one passage already; and there

is another in close connexion with it ; and the two together make up nearly all that we have observed him hinting, even incidentally, on the subject. Having referred to what he calls "*a religious sensibility*, which presents the fundamental objects involved in all religious emotion or contemplation to our immediate intuition,"—which religious sensibility he seems to identify with "*a direct and inward revelation*,"—he thus proceeds:—

"Were this power of religious sensibility absolutely perfect ; were the intuitions or revelations we thus enjoy of spiritual things *complete* ; were our whole interior being so precisely harmonized with truth itself, that we needed only to stand, as it were, in the pathway of its rays, and receive the impression in all its distinctness and brightness within us ;—then, indeed, there would be no necessity for any other mental process whatever to assure ourselves of the truth. But this perfect state of the intuitional consciousness, we know, has been disturbed ; at any rate, it does not naturally *exist* ; the reflection of spiritual truth within us is distorted by a thousand causes ;—by moral evil, by education, by prejudice, by false reasoning, and by many other influences we need not at present enumerate.

"Christianity, it is true, seeks to restore this power of spiritual intuition to its original state ; and just in proportion as it purifies the soul, elevates the mind, and brings the whole inward *man* into sympathy with the truth as it exists in the mind of God, does it really accomplish its great purpose. But to how limited an extent is this process carried in the present world ; what darkness and doubt still hover even over the really Christianized mind ; how many prejudices insensibly mingle up with our best and clearest spiritual intuitions ; and in how few cases can we say, that there is even an approximate harmony realized between man's own interior being, and the truth of God in its objective reality ! Hence, accordingly, the origin, and hence the necessity of another, and that a *logical* process, to give greater clearness and distinctiveness to our intuitions ; hence the impulse we feel to convert the spontaneous religious life into the reflective ; hence, in fine, the rise of a *formal theology*."—Pp. 195, 196.

Here we are directly at issue with our author. The necessity of a logical process, according to him, arises out of the imperfection of our spiritual intuition. In our opinion, it arises out of the nature of the communication which God has to make to us. By Mr. Morell's account, the disorder of the fall has told and taken effect upon our intuitional consciousness, which Christianity seeks to restore to its original perfection ; but inasmuch as that restoration is not complete in this life, the analytic faculty must come to our aid, that our intuitions may be ascertained and defined. We hold that the fall has made us enemies to God, and placed us as criminals at his bar ; and that the analytic faculty, or logical reason, or power of understanding language and drawing conclusions from it, must first be exercised upon

the express and formal message of reconciliation which, upon very peculiar terms, God is pleased to address to us, before the intuitional faculty, or religious sensibility, can be brought at all into play. With him, the logical reason finds its materials for systematizing Christianity in our quickened intuition; with us, in the written word of God: he makes the higher intuition hand down materials to the lower logic, to be sifted and set in order; we make the humbler functionary, the understanding, exercised on what God says in the Bible, hand up materials to the loftier regions of the soul, and set in motion all its sensibilities. In his description, the mind is like a broken mirror: when partially repaired by Christian influences, it reflects the heavenly things presented to it better than it could do before; but the reflection is still fragmentary; and hence skill and science are needed to compare the parts and construct a consistent whole. We, too, believe the mirror to be broken, and we look to Christian influences for its repair; but first and chiefly, we demand that what God tells us of heavenly things,—especially of the new heavenly things originated to suit our miserably altered state before him,—shall be considered, understood, analyzed, and known; and we hold that through this process alone of fair dealing with Gospel truth, logically viewed, will the bosom of a guilty man ever become so clear and calm as to catch again by intuition the light of God's countenance, and give back the image of his character.

The radical and fundamental difference we have been pointing out between Mr. Morell and us, runs through all the train of thought which the discussion of Christian Theology involves; and hence our remarks may now be comparatively brief. This whole part of his treatise we regard as one continued fallacy, of the figure *ὑστερον πρότερον*; putting the last first and the first last. Thus, admitting to a considerable extent the points of contrast he makes between religion and theology,—granting that the one may best denote the simple, direct, and spontaneous life of a Christian, while the other implies the reflective exercise of the judgment on the more or less complex details of a system,—and assigning to the soul's immediate and intuitive communion with God and the things of God a far higher place than we allot to any process of the mere logical understanding,—we must strenuously contend for the indispensable priority of the latter, at least in the case of fallen man; being convinced that he must first apprehend, embrace and believe the statements made concerning the way of his return and reconciliation to God, before he can have any religious sensibility of a genuine kind called forth towards God. It may be very true that a plain, practical believer may have but a spare and scanty system of Theology to

build on, and one that a ponderous schoolman would deem scarcely worthy of the name of system of Theology at all. Mr. Morell may be so far right in telling us of the comparative absence of Theology, properly so called, in the early age of Christianity. The first Christians may have had little of formal doctrine, such as has been drawn out into the long creeds and confessions of after times,—as much less of that as they had more of life and love, and sympathy and fellowship: But what then? Was there no explicit, articulate, and categorical announcement of the mind and will of God at the foundation of their spiritual experience? No doubt it was a time of wonder, excitement, enthusiasm; men's minds were agitated and stirred; and the burning fire passed spontaneously from heart to heart. Doubtless, also, there was then more of direct impulse and the gush of warm affection and strong emotion, and less of reflective investigation, than afterwards when leisure came, and the weeds of leisure, heresies, and iniquities abounding. Much minute systematizing was as unnecessary as it would have been unnatural. The question, however, we must remind Mr. Morell, is not one of degree. It is not a question concerning the more or less of the theological element there may have been in primitive Christianity. Was it there at all? Was it there as the source and spring of all? It may have been but enough to fill one single logical proposition. It may have been but one solitary announcement of a new way of dealing with men on the part of God. It may have been nothing more than the authentic proclamation of an amnesty to rebels of whatever character submitting to the Mediator. Still, we must insist upon it, that it was this new piece of authoritative information from heaven, effecting a lodgement in the understanding or logical reason of those who heard it, that became, through the accompanying power of the Holy Ghost, the spring of joy and hope, and charity and zeal; and we must ascribe after all, so far as the means or instrumentality is concerned, to a matter of fact or statement of doctrine with which the logical faculty has to do, the unlocking of the heart's fountain of tears and gladness.

Mr. Morell labours hard to reduce the primitive apostolic teaching to a very minimum of doctrinal statement, and nothing can well surpass the ingenuity of the vague and indefinite formulæ to which he has recourse. Thus he tells us that the apostles, having "awakened wherever they went,"—how, he does not say,—"the same deep emotions" that had been awakened in themselves, and so "drawn forth the cry, 'Men and brethren, what must we do,'"—"presented the great fact that Christ crucified was the way, the truth, and the life." (p. 201.) And again, he speaks of "the awakening of a new religious life by

the proclamation of human sin and human recovery by Christ, the chosen of God," (p. 203.) And these are positively the most explicit accounts of "the apostles' doctrine" (Acts ii. 42) we find him giving. How completely they fall short of what the apostles had to declare, as a direct message from God, no reader of the Book of Acts—not to mention the Epistles—needs to be reminded. But such as they are, we would like Mr. Morell to point out the distinction in kind between them and Calvin's Institutes; and we would farther ask him to say if these discoveries did not everywhere precede the awakening of deep emotions, and indeed occasion it; or, in other words, we challenge him to produce an instance in which some statement or announcement falling strictly within the category of Theology, was not manifestly the means of suggesting and calling forth the religious sensibilities that characterized that golden age.*

But the strongest and boldest of our author's flights on this subject is perhaps his passing appeal to the Reformation. We quote a passage in which he makes an important admission, fatal to his previous reasoning, and not very consistent with the instance or example that follows:—

"Theology, having once been created, can be presented didactically to the understanding before there is any awakening of the religious nature, and can even lead the mind to whom it is presented to such an interest in the subject as may issue in his spiritual enlightenment. It should be remembered, then, that in discussing philosophically the relation of theology to religion, we of course confine ourselves to the *logical* view of the question; and in this sense the order of phenomena, as we have described it, is *uniformly* preserved. Not only is this conclusion borne out by the analysis of the faculties, but it is equally verified by history itself. In the primitive Church we

* Mr. Morell misses no opportunity of having a hit at the objects of his special aversion,—the Biblical Theologians, or Divines who profess to construct their system upon the Scriptures. Thus he felicitates himself on the want of "the Christian Scriptures," at the first planting of the Church, as securing that there could be "no poring over the letter, no induction of passages, no verbal criticism whatever," (p. 203.) And again, (p. 205,) he cannot resist the temptation of a sarcastic stroke against "those who ground their theology upon an induction of individual passages, as though each passage, *independently of the spirit of the whole*, were of Divine authority." We presume he means of private interpretation, if he means anything to the purpose. It is a question, not of the authority, but of the interpretation of Scripture. Has Mr. Morell never heard of the principle of the analogy of faith, as applied to the exposition of particular texts? Does he know the use commonly made of 2 Peter i. 21? But, on his own showing, does not an induction of passages imply comparison and combination? And is not the mind of the Spirit in the Word ascertained, as the mind of any author is gathered out of his writings, by putting together all he says, in various detached portions perhaps, on any particular subject, and honestly endeavouring to make out his meaning on the whole? Surely this is a mode of dealing with the inspired record which, even though he may disapprove of it, Mr. Morell's good taste might have prevented him from treating with contemptuous scorn.

clearly trace the development of a distinctive Christian theology, *out of the religious life of those wondrous times*; and in every subsequent instance in which a new form of theology has appeared, as in the time of the Reformation, it has always sprung out of the deep religious excitement of that particular age."—Pp. 207, 208.

We certainly read the history of the Reformation in a very different light from Mr. Morell. Setting aside vague and wide agitations, of which scarcely any account is to be given,—literary, political and social, as well as religious,—proper to that critical era; and singling out, as we are entitled to do, the really Protestant and evangelical awakening, we cannot conceive a clearer case of "deep religious excitement," springing out of "a new form of theology" than that which Mr. Morell has selected as an instance of the very reverse. Was not Luther's trumpet-note of "justification by faith alone" a new form of theology in that age? And was it not that which moved the world? Nor is the connexion here merely one of accidental chronology, in the order of time; it is one of cause and effect, in the order of nature. It was a formally theological truth that Luther was enabled to seize in the firm grasp of his logical understanding, and that ever after held him sure and fast, stirring his religious sensibility to its utmost depths. And it was that same article of a standing or falling Church,—*articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*,—that revived the fellowship as well as the faith of Christendom, and made the brotherly love of the reformers of all nations—alas! for a brief space only—such as to recall the memory of the apostolic age itself.

But not to quarrel more with this instance, we thank Mr. Morell for his admission. "Theology, having once been created, can be presented didactically to the understanding before there is any awakening of the religious nature, and can even lead the mind to whom it is presented to such an interest in the subject as may issue in his spiritual enlightenment." We might ask indeed what he means by theology "having been once created?" Probably he means—created previously by man's logical understanding, out of his spiritual intuition. But may it not be—created by God himself, out of his own express and explicit discoveries of his mind and will to man? Let this, however, pass. The concession, in any view of it, is not unimportant. In his previous reasoning, Mr. Morell seems to deny the possibility of any theology, properly so called, preceding in any case the "awakening of the religious nature;" and indeed he specifies as the indispensable conditions necessary to the construction of Christian Theology these two—first, intuitional awakening, and secondly, logical thinking. We submit that the capacity or susceptibility of intuitional awakening, and not actual intuitional awakening itself, is all that need be assumed, so far as the first condition is

concerned. And as regards the other, we see not why Divine information, communicated to the logical power of thinking and understanding, may not originate the germ of the theology that is to set the whole inner man in motion.

Having considered, first, the Nature, and, secondly, the Conditions of the Christian Theology, our author comes next to the Method. He objects to the inductive method, which he thus describes :—

“It has been a very extended notion, since the prevalence of the Baconian method in scientific research, that just as the facts of natural science lie before us in the universe, and have to be generalized and systematized by the process of induction, so also the facts of theology lying before us in the Bible have simply to be moulded into a logical series, in order to create a Christian theology.”—P. 209.

And what are his objections? First, there is the usual remark, that, in point of fact, few learn their theology in this way, since most men are much influenced by tradition, authority, and other similar guides,—a remark which applies equally to the way in which we acquire our knowledge of astronomy, or any other science; and which is really not to the purpose, when the question is not concerning the actual history, but the scientific method of any study. Then there is a second and specially notable argument. We are told that we cannot apply the inductive method to the framing of a Theology out of the Scriptures, because we have to mould the ideas the Scriptures suggest into a scientific form, and adjust the formal truth into a system; and this cannot be done without some logical plan or scientific *organum*, “or, in other words, without proceeding according to certain conceptions in our very classification.” (Pp. 210, 211.) And yet, strange to say, he tells us a little farther on, that this is characteristic of all induction whatever :—

“Those who are most fluent in elevating the merits of what they term *Baconian* and *inductive* principles, as applied to theological inquiry, have commonly very little idea of what induction really involves. A thorough investigation of this very method, with the works of Professor Whewell as their guide, would show them that the classification of facts, without the proper grasp and explication of the *conceptions* in which they are to be grounded, would lead to a very unsatisfactory result, even in any case of ordinary science.”—P. 218.

So then, we cannot apply Baconian or inductive principles to the interpretation of Scripture, because in doing so, we must proceed in the very same way as in applying them to the interpretation of nature. And what Mr. Morell, after all, has proved is, either that there is no such method as the inductive at all, or that it is available for the construction of a science out of the study of the Bible, on the very same conditions on which it goes to form any

other science, out of the study of any other materials furnished by the works or ways of God.

Opposed to the inductive, or a *posteriori* method, Mr. Morell equally condemns that which, proceeding a *priori*, would "commence with the most abstract conceptions" and "purely intellectual ideas,"—"construct out of them the notion of a Deity," and thence "deduce a theory of moral government,"—"an entire system of Divine arrangements and of human duty consequent upon their primary definitions,"—making "the essence of Christianity become, to their minds, an intellectual chain of propositions." (Pp. 211, 212.)

Between the two, as a *juste milieu*, or safe *via media*, he proposes what he calls the "*reflective* method of Theology."

And it is here that he begins to open up his theory of development, of which he treats more formally in the following section of this chapter on Theology. In illustrating his "*reflective* method," he constructs, first the theologian, and then the theology. As to the first, he makes a high demand at the very outset; "the true Christian theologian must be *regenerate*,"—a pithy saying, which every pious mind will be apt to echo. But how regenerate—in what sense and by what means? All here is indefinite, mystical, transcendental. Is it that he must be born again, born of the Spirit, born by the Word; as Peter speaks,* begotten with the word of truth, according to James,† chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, to use the language of Paul?‡ Mr. Morell is by no means so explicit. What is his phraseology?

"The vital spirit of truth must have penetrated into that inmost shrine of the soul, that centre and focus of his spiritual being, that pure and essential element of man's higher nature, which is immediately connected with God, which alone holds direct intercourse with the Divine mind, to which all the other faculties stand merely in the relation of servants and emissaries."—(P. 213.)

Then he goes on to speak of "this element of the divinity within us," which—"however it may be repressed or obscured, its light extinguished, its voice silenced—can never be corrupted, never essentially perverted,"—being "the seat of the life of God in the soul of man." And after a sharp attack upon mere "logical reasoning," in which he questions Satan's gifts and qualifications as a theologian, he winds up in a sentence of surpassing beauty, which we gladly accept as a delineation of the highest and purest style of theological study. For assuredly Mr. Morell is right in saying, that adequately to describe in scientific terms the real elements of our higher life—

* 1 Peter i. 23.

† James i. 18.

‡ 2 Thess. ii. 13.

"There must be not only the keen and critical understanding, but there must be also the purity of heart, by which alone we can *see* God—the active spirit of duty, by which alone we can know of his doctrine—the love of which it is said, he that possesseth it dwelleth in God, and God in him."—Pp. 214, 215.

So far well: so far we are agreed. Alas! that at the very next step we must part company again. That the pious man, the spiritual man,* the pure in heart, is the best, or rather the only true Theologian, we most frankly grant. But still the question remains, whence and how does he construct his Theology? Out of the Scriptures, we reply, by the fair and candid use of his logical faculty of understanding, quickened and guided as it will doubtless be by the spiritual discernment he has attained, but still exercised according to the ordinary principles on which we proceed in ascertaining an author's views from his books. The cases are exactly parallel. The more we know a man, with that intuitive insight which confidence and love and fellowship give, the better can we understand and interpret his writings. So is it with the writings of God. The man according to God's own heart will best gather up the indications of his mind and will in his word: but it is out of that word alone, and by its standard alone, that he will frame the articles of his creed. This, however, we fear, is by no means Mr. Morell's view.

For, having now got his duly-qualified Theologian, whither does he direct him for his theology? That, obviously, is the only relevant question. And here we find that, "to ensure the purity and adequacy of our religious intuitions," we must have recourse, first, to "the spirit of the Scriptures, the life and character of Christ, the great ideas involved in the apostolic mission;" next, to "the history of the Church, its development, and the great religious impulses under which the best and holiest men have lived and acted;" and lastly, to the practice of personal piety, that we may "realize in ourselves the spirit and elevation of the Christian life, and foster the whole by Christian activity, by fellowship, by self-renunciation, and by communion with God." The spirit, the history, the experience of Christianity, form this triple cord.

It is a high ideal, and far be it from us to find fault with it as the ideal of a fit student of Theology. He should be all this, and more. But the method of the student's preparation is one thing, and the method of the study itself is another. How the inquirer is to be qualified, is a different question from how the inquiry is to be conducted; at least, with our views, we must insist on the distinction. Not so Mr. Morell. In his view, the distinction vanishes; for in fact, according to him, the qualifications of the theologian form the materials of the theology. Given a theologian coming up to his criterion, and all Mr.

Morell would have him to do is, to translate his own intuitions into a reflective logical form, "to grasp the great moral and spiritual ideas involved in his religious life, and represent them, as nearly as possible, in logical propositions."—(P. 216.)

But Mr. Morell is no individualist. He has no idea of our relying on our own direct intuitions, or on the reflex judgments which may reduce them. We are to take into account the "facts of history, facts relating to the formation and growth of the Christian Church, facts in the religious life of our own and every age." (ibid.) And having first analyzed, or criticised, or generalized these facts, and then drawn them out, by a process of "*deduction*," "from the principles already established, to the less general notions implicitly involved in them," we must "*verify* every result, by an appeal to human experience, knowing how easily we may be led on in the ardour of reasoning to results which are entirely incompatible with the laws of human nature, and the daily phenomena of the religious life. In this way we shall originate a series of propositions, which will be as it were *authoritative expressions* of the Christian consciousness, uttering itself articulately in the ears of humanity."

This last sentence should be well weighed. It is a brief compendium of Mr. Morell's entire philosophy, as applied to the Christian system, and it is pregnant with very serious consequences. Let it be observed, that this method of constructing a Theology is altogether subjective, recognising no objective standard whatsoever. We are to be brought, or to bring ourselves, as best we may, into a certain high and transcendental spiritual state, and we are to translate the intuitions proper to such a state into logical forms and phrases. But, distrusting ourselves, we are to call in the Church, and consult the general mind of Christendom, or of its best and holiest men, as that mind unfolded itself in the beginning, and has continued to unfold itself from age to age. And between the two, our own and the Church's subjective experience, we are to "originate a series of propositions, which shall be, as it were, the *authoritative expressions* of the Christian consciousness, uttering itself articulately in the ears of humanity."

And now, a most vital question arises. Is this Christian consciousness a fixed or a variable thing? Is it one uniform experience from the beginning hitherto, or does it admit of fluctuations—of progress—from age to age? As in the individual, so in humanity at large, "every thing of an intuitional character," as Mr. Morell argues, "unfolds itself more and more, and has an organic vital development." In accordance with this axiom, he holds the Christian consciousness to have been imperfect at first, and progressive since. "In the case of the apostles, the spiritual vision was as nearly as possible perfect."

But they failed to communicate this attainment to others. "All they could do was to arouse the religious feelings; to direct them aright to their proper objects; to set the Christian life in operation; and then leave it, under the promise of divine aid, to its future development."—P. 220.

Now, let it be noted, that this Christian life, which is another name for the Christian consciousness, is the only groundwork on which, according to Mr. Morell, theology can be constructed. Theology, in fact, with him, is merely the logical expression of that life or consciousness. But, however it might be with the apostles, the community of believers generally received that life at first, and manifested that consciousness, only, as it were, in the germ or bud. The growth, the expansion, the ripe maturity, came afterwards, and is partly yet to come. The life, the consciousness, is progressive, and so also must be the Theology that reflects and moulds it.

We may observe here that there is another reason stated by our author for "the progressiveness of Theology as a science," on which we do not touch. We refer to the room there is for improvement in "the nature of the criticism we employ in constructing a formal science." We are not indeed so sanguine as Mr. Morell; we do not expect so much as he does from Germany, with all its profounder philosophy, in the way of "furnishing a more subtle instrument of analysis to carry on the work of the theologian." (p. 222.) We admit, however, that our means and attainments, our apparatus and skill available for this, as for other studies, may be progressive. And, at all events, our question with Mr. Morell relates entirely to the other factor or element concerned in the construction of Theology,—the subject, namely,—the matter or substance of the science, and not the instrument. Anatomy is in a high degree a progressive science; its dissecting-knife acquires a sharper edge, and is guided by a keener eye and more delicate hand; but the materials it deals with are unchanged, being the bones and sinews of the human frame. The rapid strides of chemistry have filled our age with wonder; the implements and organs of its analysis now, would have seemed as miracles to the cotemporaries of Priestley; but the things the science handles are the same; the contents of its crucible are what they ever were. Progress of this sort we do not refuse to own in the study of Theology, though we may not anticipate so much as Mr. Morell does from its onward course.

But the real point at issue is what relates to the materials of the science; are they fixed, or variable? Are they to be found in the written word of God, or in the Christian consciousness of men? To what test or standard is the Theologian to bring

either his spiritual intuitions, or the logical propositions in which he embodies them? Is it "to the law and to the testimony," (Isaiah viii. 20),—to the Scriptures of truth? Or is it to a certain common feeling, or common sense, floating from age to age among the *élite* of the Catholic Christian community?

Upon this last supposition, which is the opinion of Mr. Morell, we confess ourselves altogether unable to resist the reasoning of Mr. Newman, in his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. He too holds that the Christian religion was given at first in the germ or bud, and that it was left to grow and expand in the actual history and experience of the Christian Church. Nor is he less cautious than Mr. Morell in maintaining the essential identity of character throughout between the incipient germ and the gradually-developed growth: he carefully gives tests for distinguishing between development and corruption, and these tests might almost be summed up in Mr. Morell's comprehensive caveat:—

"The only idea we would impress upon the mind of every reader is, that *development* does not imply any organic *change* in the real and essential elements of Christian truth. Different as the seed in its first germination may be in all appearance from the perfect plant, yet the latter is simply the unfolding of what that seed at first implicitly contained. And so is it with the development of Christian theology in the world."—P. 222.

Mr. Newman, indeed, calls for what he terms a "developing authority in Christianity," and finds it in the Papacy. Mr. Morell, on the other hand, feels no need of such a regulating power, and assigns no place to it. But, for our part, if compelled to choose between them, we confess we would hesitate; and at all events, the difference, as it seems to us, is accidental and unimportant, in comparison with the principle they hold in common. Let that principle be once admitted, and it is an even chance whether men go to Germany or to Rome.*

We speak, let it be borne in mind, of systems, not of men. The spirit of Mr. Morell is wide as the poles asunder from that of Mr. Newman, and has far more of our sympathy. But we cannot conceal our alarm, when we find a writer on the side of what bears the aspect of high spirituality, avowing the very views which, in the hands of a thinker of another caste—as devout, we believe, and greatly more learned—are made to minister to one of the most subtle and plausible forms which the Protean genius of Popery has ever, even in our day, assumed.

* We really beg Mr. Morell's pardon; we cannot resist the temptation to bring out pointedly our meaning. He will understand that we intend no disrespect by naming Germany, as the country where the sort of theology we dread has, for the present at least, its chief seat.

What, at the best, is Mr. Morell's theory of Christianity in its origin and advancement? A Divine person appears upon the earth, gathers around him a knot of admirers and adherents, exhibits before them, in the highest possible perfection, the Divine life, and, to a certain extent, leavens them with the same spirit with which he is himself inspired. After a brief interval, during which takes place a death and a resurrection of mysterious significance, a scene occurs unprecedented and unparalleled in the world's annals. Thousands of all nations are assembled; lambent flames are seen descending; strange utterances are heard, but such as always some in the motley audience can understand; a general commotion ensues; and a few words, reciting the recent history of Jesus, separate a large number from the general mass, whom the simple rite of baptism seals as henceforth to be a peculiar people. A society is formed, knit together rather by harmony of hearts than by express or formal unity of mind; there is a sympathetic love and joy pervading all the members; a sense of some vast evil escaped, and some incalculable blessing gained; a felt relief; a realized enlargement and escape. Few questions are asked; few conditions prescribed. There is that strange mutual understanding of one another—as in a sudden common calamity, or in a sudden and unlooked for rescue, beyond the need of words to certify, or the power of words fully to explain. There is a company of survivors, remnants of a sad and universal wreck, clustering and nestling close on a narrow rock, and eagerly waving a flag of invitation to the struggling victims of the storm all around. Gradually, time rolls on; the enthusiasm and the wild energy of the first struggle are over. The tempest mitigates its fury, though its desolations are as real as ever; and the little band of brothers, knit by the kindred sense of danger and deliverance, becoming more calm, and cool, and collected, have leisure for reflection on what has happened, and for questionings and explanations among themselves. Then comes the time for gathering up the experiences of a crisis too terrible and wonderful to be at the moment analyzed. The company, brought together at first like the hen's brood when the hawk is seen, have now to organize themselves, and embody and express their views. In doing so, they derive valuable aid from reminiscences and records of the scenes they have passed through, and the persons they have met with. But what they have to accomplish is the articulate expression of their own consciousness, in connexion with all these strange occurrences, and resulting from them. This they try to do as best they may. But succeeding generations have more leisure, and better means, and higher powers. Always, therefore, persevering in the same line,—drawing out

the same thread, but with increasing expertness and improved machinery, the body, so wondrously constituted at first, continues to unfold the original principles of its being; and they who live, and think, and feel, under the higher inspiration granted to all like-minded with the first disciples, have thus from age to age an expanding mould of Catholic Christian sentiment, in which they may cast, for the testing or the amalgamating of it, the melted ore of their own divine aspirations.

We have not meant to caricature; and we trust we have not done so. We put it to every candid and intelligent reader of Mr. Morell's book to say if this is not a favourable representation of his theory, rather than the reverse. It is distinct, but, we trust, not unfair. And now we ask, wherein does it differ from Mr. Newman's view of the rise and progress of Christianity? Or, quitting Mr. Newman, the association of whose name may, perhaps, be deemed offensive, we ask where is a tossed spirit to find a resting-place for the sole of his feet?—where but in a high-church theory?—where but in Rome itself? It may be easy for some minds of strong and sanguine temperament, to balance themselves between their own intuitions and the general Christian consciousness of the age, as Mr. Morell directs, and so to reach a logical product compounded of private judgment and the common-sense of the Christian body, that may be to them sufficient and satisfactory. But ordinary minds cannot rest here. Mr. Morell may rely upon it, that his sublime mysticism of ultra-spiritual phrasology will not meet the case of a sin-sick soul, or a conscience labouring under a real conviction of guilt. And it is with the deepest grief we express our firm belief that his theology is essentially of such a character as to send all that are thus broken-hearted to Rome's refuges of lies, while as for those who are heart-whole, and can dispense with a clear and valid ground of peace, it provides enough of vague sentiment to interest and awaken, without either any appeal based on God's violated law to subdue and to alarm, or any authentic and authoritative message of mercy to reconcile them, as sinners, to the Holy One and the Just.

We have again to apologize to our readers—first, for the detail into which we have entered, at the risk of making our articles uninteresting or unintelligible to persons unacquainted with Mr. Morell's book; and, secondly, for the necessarily imperfect manner in which our limits have compelled us to discuss the several points on which we seem to be at issue with our author. We might have treated the work before us differently, and made it the occasion of general disquisition on the philosophical and religious tendencies of the age; and for such disquisition it is

suggestive of many pregnant thoughts. But we have considered it more our duty to follow Mr. Morell step by step, and meet, as best we could, his arguments and statements in their order.

It is a humbler task we have thus assigned to ourselves, but more needful, at least in the first instance; nor are we ashamed to confess, that we are more at home in attempting to bring this new philosophy to the test of the common-sense reasoning we are accustomed to in our own British schools of Logic and Divinity, than if we were to speculate on the relations in which it may stand to the higher transcendentalisms of another soil and climate. For this reason, also, having respect to our own ignorance and incompetency, and dreading the dizzy heights where plain, practical thinkers are apt to lose their self-possession in the rare atmosphere of mystic generalization, we are anxious, before we close, to fasten down the discussion, so far as we are concerned, to certain definite, categorical, matter-of-fact issues, such as a jury of intelligent British readers may intelligently try. We are the more desirous of this, because we know not how far we may have laid ourselves open, in some of our remarks, to the criticism of that higher science, with which our acquaintance is very superficial and second-hand. We have a kind of suspicion or fear, that it might be possible to divert and draw off our available force in skirmishes about debatable outfields, in which, unskilled as we are to thread the thickets and tread the swamps of the vast Germanic forest, our feet might be hopelessly entangled. Hence we would seek to concentrate our strength upon a few positions in regard to which we feel that we have firmer footing.

The positions, however, let it be observed, are not such as to be at all affected by anything peculiar in the higher regions that we shun. For we altogether deny that Mr. Morell's philosophy in the least degree touches—either as to the state of the question, or as to the way of arguing it—any one of the great fundamental topics which the ordinary defenders of religion, natural and revealed, have hitherto considered themselves bound to dispose of. There is, no doubt, an air of originality, and a certain somewhat ostentatious display of fresh theories and modes of thought. But, after all, we believe it will be found on a perusal of the work, that there is really nothing in it very new in this respect; nothing that may not fairly be classed under one or other of the many varied phases which mental and metaphysical science is from time to time assuming in the philosophic schools. We are deeply persuaded, indeed, that no peculiar system regarding the constitution of the human mind,—the analysis of its faculties, and its laws of intuition, intellect, and emotion,—will ever have any material bearing on the momentous practical questions of morality and religion, which it concerns man, as an

accountable and immortal being to have settled ; and of this, at least, we are sure, that Mr. Morell has made out no claim to be exempted from the necessity of a fair discussion of these questions on their own proper merits, and according to their own appropriate kinds of evidence. He is not entitled to envelop them in the mist of any subtle, psychological speculation, as if he would summarily sweep them all up into one aerial chariot that may waft them far aloft into a region of dim sublimity. We insist upon his coming down to deal with these questions in a more pedestrian style, taking them up in detail, and meeting them fairly in the face, with the proofs severally belonging to them. For they are questions far too vitally interesting to the welfare and the hopes of man, to be got rid of by any side-wind. They must be directly met and answered.

Passing over, then, Mr. Morell's first two chapters—on the Faculties of the Human Mind, and on the distinction between the Logical and Intuitional Consciousness—although we still think that the germ of not a little error may be found lurking, as we have endeavoured to show, in his classification and distribution of the mental powers—we proceed at once to his direct exposition of religion, natural and revealed ; and we challenge attention to the following particulars, in their order, as instances of grave omission, if not of something worse, in this Divine Philosophy.

1. In the department of natural religion, or religion in general, the inquiry into the peculiar essence of which occupies his third chapter, we repeat our demand for some account of the facts and the phenomena of conscience. With Mr. Morell, the essence of religion is a sense of dependence ; with us, it is at least quite as much a sense of duty. God, with him, is the Absolute Being ; with us, he is the Moral Governor. The ideas of law, obligation, demerit, condemnation, require to be explained. They enter into the very heart of natural religion. In fact, man's responsibility is really its sum and substance. Mr. Morell, however, takes no notice whatever of that feature of our moral nature ; the supremacy of conscience in itself, and as attesting the supremacy of a law and a lawgiver, forms no part of his natural theology ; and we complain of this as a great desideratum.

2. Postponing his inquiry, in his fourth chapter, into the Essence of Christianity, and taking up his two chapters on Revelation and Inspiration, we think it clear that he was bound, even in a philosophical point of view, to discuss the subject of the evidence of testimony, human and divine. Without such a discussion, his whole theory is one huge *petitio principii*—a quiet assumption of the very point in dispute. The intuitional and the logical consciousness are not our only sources of knowledge

and guides of thought. Speech and language—information by word of mouth or through signs—belief of what another tells,—these are real phenomena; they deserve consideration: nor can any view of man's nature, as a social and religious being, be complete and comprehensive, that does not contain in it something equivalent to a philosophy of testimony.

3. More particularly, the whole subject of miracles, which Mr. Morell has altogether omitted, must have a place in any comprehensive investigation of the nature of religion, if it is to be at all valid and satisfactory. The two questions of the credibility of miracles themselves, and their significancy as bearing upon the statements of doctrine, or systems of polity, in connexion with which they profess to be wrought, are questions which have always hitherto, in this country, received attention from all philosophic writers on revelation; and Mr. Morell should either have descended into the arena to grapple with them, or condescended to show cause why he did not. How far miracles are capable of proof, and how far they are capable of proving anything above or beyond themselves, are inquiries which we have a right to insist upon having thoroughly prosecuted, before we enter upon the contents of any revelation like that of the Bible, which throughout professes to be mixed up with, and mainly based upon, the evidence and authority of miracles.

4. We are well entitled to insist on having a much more explicit and unequivocal intimation than Mr. Morell has given us of his views on this particular question. Have we, or have we not, in the Scriptures, anywhere and anyhow, an authentic, authoritative revelation of the mind and will of God, in the common and ordinary sense of the term revelation? Has God told us there anything whatever of his manner of dealing with man that we could not otherwise have known, or that no created intelligence could have known without God telling it? Mr. Morell owes it to the Christian community of his country to be perfectly unambiguous upon this point. Apart altogether from the question—how far Divine truth can ever be adequately apprehended otherwise than by the intuitional faculty,—apart also from any question as to the necessity of inward spiritual illumination,—and apart from the farther question, how far and in what sense plenary inspiration is to be ascribed to the whole or any particular part of the Bible,—we have a right to know if he admits any communication to have been made by God to man, conveying information to be received upon the testimony of God, precisely as we receive information upon the testimony of our fellow-men. If he admits this, he ought to enter far more fully than he does into the amount and value of the information so received. If he does not, the Christian public of Britain ought to know it. Nor let Mr.

Morell say here that we wish to run him down by means of the senseless clamour of bigoted religionists. We only wish him to let us know, and to let the world know, what he really means. For our part, we consider the discussion even of the vastly important subject of Inspiration to be, so far as Mr. Morell is concerned, of very minor and subordinate importance. The real question to be discussed with him is—does he allow, or does his philosophy leave any room for his allowing, the reality of any objective revelation at all? Was there ever, on the part of God, an articulate utterance of his will to man? Did he ever commission apostles or prophets to speak in his name? We ask again—what does Mr. Morell make of the giving of the law on Sinai? or of the discourses and doctrinal summaries of Christ, say those, for instance, recorded in the Gospel by John? Nor will it do to evade these questions by reminding us that no statements, whether of fact or of opinion, communicated from without, can of themselves constitute knowledge or belief in the recipient mind—that they must be grasped and moulded by the faculties within—and that, after all, the product is the result of the intuitional or logical consciousness exercised upon these materials. All this may be true, but it is wholly away from the real question. What I say to a friend, whether in the way of discovery or in the way of argument, does not become part of his mental experience or activity, and is not properly his, until it has been subjected to the crucible of his intelligence, and undergone, perhaps, a process of decomposition and reconstruction there. But does it follow that what I say to him has no distinct and substantive existence, apart from his consciousness? My speech to him—or my letter—is a reality; let him make what he can of it. So with respect to God. It is a mere truism, and in the way Mr. Morell uses it, something worse, to reiterate the remark that even if God were to speak to us directly, and face to face, what he says would have to take its shape, and form, and hue, to a large extent, from the laws and faculties of our intellectual nature. Be it so. Let it be granted that in common with every objective communication of whatever sort to man, the utterances of the Divine voice—the messages of God—must in this way become subjective in our consciousness. What is that to the purpose, when the question is as to the actual reality of these utterances as matters of fact, and the authority of these messages as accredited from heaven? Mr. Morell, in short, knows what is ordinarily meant by a Divine Revelation, alike in the theological and in the common language of his country; and without putting a new and refined sense upon the term, he can surely tell us, and he ought to tell us, how far he holds such a revelation to be contained in the Bible.

5. Mr. Morell, we think, even as a philosopher, should have gone deeper into the rationale of the construction of a theology, whether out of the materials of Christian experience, or out of the materials of the Scriptures. His treatment of that part of his subject seems to us most unsatisfactory and unworthy. In particular, we demand of him a far fairer and fuller examination of the real theory that it concerns him to oppose. It is easy, we repeat, to get the better of a man of straw, and show prowess in presence of a wooden soldan. Mr. Morell is thus valiant oftener than once in his volume. Let him do justice to the hypothesis, granting that it were nothing more, on which a biblical theology is founded. Let it be granted that God can speak to men, either directly, or through the minds and mouths and pens of chosen individuals of our race; let it be supposed that he has done so;—and also that he can accredit by suitable and sufficient evidence, and that he has thus accredited the messages he has sanctioned. Let it be farther conceded that we have in the Old and New Testaments the substance of the communications God has made. This is all we ask here; let the degree of fulness and accuracy with which these communications have been handed down to us be left undetermined. We put it to Mr. Morell, upon the view thus assumed, to tell us what else we can do than just sit down and examine the written record, collect and compare whatever passages appear to throw light on one another; and form the best judgment we can, upon a minute examination of particulars, and a careful survey of the whole, as to what God meant us to learn from them concerning himself and his ways, and to receive as true upon his own testimony. And we farther put it to Mr. Morell to tell us what other procedure on our part would be consistent, we say not with a belief that the Scriptures are verbally inspired, but with a belief that they contain any objective revelation from God at all. It is all very well for Mr. Morell to denounce criticism and induction as methods of theology, and to ridicule what he calls a poring over the letter, and so forth. But let him speak plainly, and let us know where we are. Either we have, in the Bible, messages from God, telling us what he does, and what he would have us to do; or we have not. If we have, will Mr. Morell have the kindness to point out any other possible mode of procedure than the very induction he stigmatizes? If we have not, the Bible may give us an insight into what gifted, pious, spiritual men have thought and felt, and we may be the better for that insight, as we are the better for converse with the learned and holy dead whose volumes enrich our shelves. But it is no word of God to us any more. Let us understand clearly if it is to this that Mr. Morell's philosophy would bring us.

6. We complain of it as a great omission, that we have no full and formal discussion of the moral nature and condition of man as a fallen being. We have said enough, perhaps, upon this subject already; and would only add here, that whether it is an objective or a subjective philosophy of religion that is to be constructed, in either view the actual state of humanity ought to be ascertained, as one of the most essential elements or conditions of the process. How is man treated by God? How, under the treatment of God, does he exhibit and unfold himself? These are the two main problems of religion, in its objective and subjective sides respectively. It is in the practical solution of these two problems that man's interest, as a religious being, lies. But it is plain that neither can be satisfactorily solved, without some clear and consistent idea being formed of man's natural state before God. The existence and influence of moral evil, Mr. Morell, of course, admits, though his allusions to it are of the most vague and cursory kind. Something like an impotency in the intuitional faculty as to its power of grasping Divine truth, he recognises as the consequence of man's moral and spiritual derangement. This he expects to find to a large extent remedied, through the inward and outward influences of a subjective process of illumination. But beyond a slight hint or two of this sort, we look in vain for any deep or serious conviction of guilt or corruption, of misery or danger, in the present condition of the human race. Are the affections of the heart disordered? in what respect? and to what extent? Is the carnal mind enmity against God? Or, again, are we, by nature, dead in trespasses and sins? the children of wrath? the objects of Divine displeasure? lying under a Divine sentence of condemnation? exposed to everlasting punishment in the life to come? Mr. Morell may say that these are questions falling within the province of theology proper, rather than of the philosophy of theology. With deference, however, we submit that a survey of the map of human nature, as both experience and Scripture represent it, forms a necessary part of a philosopher's undertaking, when he proposes to sound the depths and scale the heights of that spiritual economy in which man and his Maker meet together; and, at any rate, he surely owes it to the prevalent religion of the most devout of his countrymen—and that portion, too, not the least intelligent and learned—either to set aside the current theological view of the fall, or to find a place for it in his scientific system.

7. Lastly, not to multiply particulars, we crave a more explicit deliverance on the nature of the Christian scheme. Has the Almighty really devised, executed, and revealed a plan of mercy? If so, what is it? Is the Christian dispensation remedial of the

evils entailed by the Fall? If so, in what sense, and to what effect? What does Mr. Morell admit and hold, as to the evil for which provision needs to be made, and as to the nature of the provision made for it? Does he believe in Christ as substituted in the room of all that are to be saved? Does he believe in the necessity of an entire renewal of nature, in subordination to that substitution, and as a necessary condition of voluntary consent to it? Has he any clear ground in all his system for the actual personal reconciliation of offenders to Him whom they have offended? We are quite aware of the distaste with which Mr. Morell may regard these questions, and of the loop-hole he may take advantage of, in the higher generalization into which he would sublimate or evaporate the practical essence of the Gospel. We are aware also of the reply which obviously suggests itself,—that we are seeking to involve a calm and lofty ideal of what may harmonize all hearts, in the comparatively low strife of wrangling controversialists. It really is not so. We are prepared to make large allowances for the effect likely to be produced on a mind like Mr. Morell's by doubtful disputation, and the multiplying of words without knowledge. We are not mere martinets in enforcing every iota of an orthodox creed or an evangelical persuasion. But we must be satisfied on such vital matters as these. Is there really, as a matter of fact, an interposition of God for the rescue of man from ruin? Is that interposition of a mediatorial or vicarious nature? Is the effect of it a reconciliation of the individual sinner to his Maker, exactly similar in kind, though no otherwise comparable, to what takes place when an offender among men comes to terms of peace with the party offended? Is this a reality? And we cannot see how any philosophy of religion, proposed to the acceptance of the people of this country, can be regarded as complete, which does not either set aside that idea by a valid disproof of it, or account for it by a well-weighed and well-considered analogy.

The occurrence of this last word suggests a painful but profitable comparison. We cannot speak of analogy in connexion with religion, without remembering the immortal Butler. We do not indeed consider even his work as complete; but it is on the right foundation, and in the right direction. We cannot say this of Mr. Morell's production; though we hold it to be strictly parallel to that of Butler. In other words, we regard Mr. Morell's *Philosophy of Religion, Natural and Revealed*, as an attempt of the same kind with Butler's *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed*; insomuch that we cannot count it unfair to originate a comparison or contrast. Such a comparison or contrast we have no intention of prosecuting at present. But we see nothing wrong in appealing to the spirit of nationality

proper to the philosophy, as well as the politics of Britain, so far, at least, as to hint, that we have a fundamental philosophy of religion of our own in the work of Butler: and that, with all his wish to recommend and insinuate another, Mr. Morell has not touched the former.

We confess we would like to see Mr. Morell fairly grappling, first, with the Sermons; and, secondly, with the Analogy of Bishop Butler. We would like to see what he makes of the supremacy of conscience, which is the key-stone of the one structure, and of the moral government of God, which is at once the foundation and the head corner-stone of the other. The Bishop treads comparatively a plain and homely footpath. He gathers up the utterances of the common sense and common experience of mankind. He does not soar into the region of the absolute: but he has a firm grasp of the ideas of law, and government, and judgment; or these ideas have a firm grasp of him, which is more than can be said of Mr. Morell.

Not much less than half the volume remains almost untouched, including the chapters on Popular Theology, Fellowship, Certitude, (on which chapter on Certitude we made some remarks in connexion with the subject of Revelation,) the Significance of the Past, and the Relation between Philosophy and Theology. The first two of these chapters, the Analysis of Popular Theology and Fellowship, may be regarded as Mr. Morell's practical application of the principles he has been unfolding in his discussion of Revelation, Inspiration, and Christian Theology; the former being destructive, the latter constructive; the one pulling down, the other setting up; and both together bringing the Christian community to Mr. Morell's ideal of perfectibility, bare of doctrinal truth, rich in sentimental lore. We cannot criticise these chapters; but we must have a word of parting comment on them.

The essence of the Analysis of Popular Theology lies in the following sentences, which occur at the very beginning of it.—

“First of all, then, let us look to the popular theology of our own age and country *as a whole*. We find existing amongst different communities a system of theoretical doctrine, which defines with considerable precision the truth they regard as valid and Divine respecting the relations which the Almighty sustains to man in his creation, preservation, redemption, and final salvation. This doctrine having been gradually brought into the form of clear and logical statement, now presents the above relations to us, not as though they were spiritual *conceptions*, which are involved in the awakening and illumination of our religious nature, but rather as *facts* which can be presented in their full proportions to the *understanding*.”—Pp. 228, 229.

It is an important admission, we remark by the way, that the

existing theology of our Christian country is what we may call relational; and that the question between that theology and Mr. Morell turns upon this narrow point, namely, whether these "relations which the Almighty sustains to man in his creation, preservation, redemption, and final salvation," are "spiritual *conceptions*, which are involved in the awakenment and illumination of our religious nature,"—or "*facts* which can be presented in their full proportions to the *understanding*." Will Mr. Morell abide by this state of the question? On our part, we demur, of course, to the clause "in their full proportions;" which is quietly a trick of Mr. Morell's, we are sorry to say not uncommon, by means of which he entraps his adversaries unwarily, giving his own view, and professing to give theirs, in a well-poised antithesis, while he slyly insinuates a qualifying phrase that spoils all. Who ever said—except Rationalists and Socinians—that the "*facts*" of Christianity could be "presented in their full proportions to the *understanding*," if by the understanding be meant what Mr. Morell means—the logical reason, the mere power of gathering up inferences and drawing conclusions? We have no hesitation in characterizing the insertion of the words, "in their full proportions," as a *ruse* unworthy of the theme, the occasion, and the author. But we ask again, will he abide by this statement of the question, as fair at least on his side? We, on ours, require nothing more than this explanation—that the "relations" spoken of are "facts presented to the *understanding*" primarily, but of such a character that, to apprehend them "in their full proportions," taxes the intuitional consciousness, the spiritual discernment? Will Mr. Morell consent to join issue upon this adjustment of the lists? Will he accept his own statement of his own side of the alternative? Then, will he explain what he means by the "relations which the Almighty sustains to man" being "spiritual *conceptions* involved in the awakenment and illumination of our religious nature?" The relations of "redemption and final salvation," let it be noted, are placed in the same category in this respect with the relations of "creation and preservation." What can Mr. Morell mean by telling us that the relations of redemption and final salvation are spiritual conceptions involved in the awakenment and illumination of our religious nature? We can see how the relations of creation and preservation may be so, in respect of the original discoveries made of himself by the Creator to the creature. But according to all our ordinary notions of it, Christianity is, as regards man's knowledge of it, an afterthought of the Divine mind, proceeding upon the breach of a previous and prior arrangement for man's happiness, and proposing an arrangement entirely new. And if it be so, what

is that religious nature of ours, in the awakenment and illumination of which the relations of redemption and final salvation are involved? Of course, if by illumination we may understand the objective presentation of a new mode of procedure on the part of God, we may be at one with our author; but if by that term he means merely the intensifying of the power of vision, or the intensifying of the light that shows things as they are, or both, and nothing more, we repeat our assertion referring to our former argument, that Mr. Morell's Christianity, after all, is but a republication or revival of the religion of nature.

We might point out many instances of illogical and unfair reasoning, with much vague and wordy pomp of well-sounding phraseology, in this chapter on Popular Theology. Will Mr. Morell explain what he means by such verbiage as this—"revealing to the apostles themselves the Divine conceptions in which their religious vitality was all cradled," (p. 238;) or "the consciousness of redemption through a personal Redeemer," (p. 239;) or our "having in Christ holiness, rectitude, love, mercy, reconciliation, sacrifice, and life from the dead,"—a strange enough medley,—“all embodied in an historical and concrete reality—a reality to which * * * the Christian consciousness of redeemed humanity has ever looked backward as to the embodiment of its highest and purest ideal.”—(p. 242.) We humbly profess our entire inability to attach any definite sense to these misty and cloudy collocations of the English tongue. We doubt much if they are consistent with the recognition of the substitution of Christ, as a sacrifice of atonement, in the room and stead of the guilty, and the actual personal negotiation of peace, on the part of every soul that has sinned, with the offended law-giver, on the ground of this great propitiation.

Then there is the wretched quibble about the use of the word "facts" in Theology, which we would leave Mr. Morell to settle with the Right Rev. Bishop, who, at least in modern times, has the credit of raising it. Very far, indeed, are we from sympathizing with the outcry made against Dr. Hampden on his presentation to the Episcopal bench; as far as we believe Dr. Hampden himself will be from sympathizing with the use made of his name and cause, rather than his writings, by Mr. Morell. Will the Bishop's Introduction to his recent edition of the Bampton Lectures,—especially with reference to the meaning of the word "fact" in Theology,—modify Mr. Morell's commendation of him? Perhaps not, for it is good to have a Bishop, especially a persecuted Bishop, on one's side. But we pause for a reply.

Will Mr. Morell say what he means by his strange and startling limitation of the term in the phrase "fact of sense," as applied to the death of Christ?—(p. 237.) Is there no other fact than

one of sense? If there be, then where is all his special pleading about the historical facts of Christianity being the primary and only substantial elements of theology? Does he admit that there may be facts that are not "facts of sense?" Then, what are they? Are they facts of testimony?—Human and Divine? Are they such facts as need to be made known from above? Such as that the eternal Father hath from everlasting a co-eternal Son, and that there is in the Divine essence a Spirit breathing life into the creature from the Father and the Son? or that he who was born at Bethlehem, and died on Calvary, sustained a near and intimate relation to God—a relation as near and intimate as that which he sustained to man? or that, when he suffered, it was the Holy One and the Just taking the place of sinners, as guilty under the violated law of God? True, these are not "facts of sense." But why this qualification? I meet John in the street; that is a "fact of sense." He is the son of James, and he came on an errand from James to me. Is this a fact or not? It is certainly not a "fact of sense."

But we are ashamed of such quibbling and word-catching; and we would be equally ashamed of any attempt formally to answer Mr. Morell's *ad captandum* use of the admitted difficulty. Christians of different denominations feel in holding to their conviction of the supreme authority of Scripture, and yet fraternizing with those who interpret Scripture differently. To a candid man, the explanation is to be found in the fallibility of human reason, on whatever subject it is exercised, and in the feeling and acknowledgment of that fallibility. Mr. Morell himself admits, as far as individuals are concerned, the fallibility of their intuitions. We admit the fallibility of their logical processes of thought: and hence we deduce an argument for mutual forbearance, in the exercise of brotherly love. But we must tell Mr. Morell that he does ill indeed to dress up plausibly the common Romish or Infidel objection about differences of opinion among Christians, and present it fresh as an argument for there being nothing definite at all set down as being of the essence of Christianity.

Mr. Morell longs for Christian union, and so do we. He despises the attempt to unite men who differ in some things, but agree in other things more important. This, in his view, is a confession they avowedly add their own inventions to what they receive as the truth of God. We deny the fairness of this inference: excepting only on one supposition, that an infallible authority for interpreting Scripture exists, and that they all claim to have that authority. If, on the contrary, they own their own fallibility—all of them—and simply avow a hope that in dealing as fairly as human infirmity will permit with the

Divine Record, they will experience the aid of the Divine Spirit, we submit that they have put themselves in the way of a harmony and agreement in spirit, sentiment, and doctrine, much beyond what Mr. Morell's indefinite idealism will ever produce. For, after all, the number of those who even profess to appeal to Scripture alone as a rule of faith and manners is comparatively small; still smaller those who really do so. But progress may be made towards a common understanding when there is an acknowledged test and touchstone of belief. Mr. Morell sets us all at sea. A common belief with him is out of the question. But if only men will consent not to tell one another what they believe—never to discuss questions of opinion—to abstain from even a whisper, distinct and categorical, as to who Christ really was—what he did, and why he did it on the earth,—to exercise, in short, a prudent intellectual reserve, and lose themselves in the glow and rapture of emotional brotherhood, the millennium of an inarticulate harmony is at hand. But after all, would it be any better than the wolf literally lying down with the kid, and the lion eating straw like the ox? Surely the intelligent race of men demand and deserve, through the goodness and grace of God, a more sensible union of minds, as the condition of a sentimental union of hearts.

ART. III.—*Restauration des Sciences Philosophiques. Introduction à l'Etude de la Philosophie.* Par VINCENT GIOBERTI. In 3 vols. Paris.

GIOBERTI is, in many respects, one of the most remarkable men of the present age. He has been characterized by le Comte César Balbo, one of his colleagues at Turin, as “un des premiers philosophes de la Chrétienté,” and by the Bishop of Asti, as “un des véritables sages de tous les temps.” No one who has read his writings, and traced his career in life, can fail to connect his history with the religious and social developments which are still in progress in Europe; or to acknowledge that, whether regard be had to personal, or philosophical, or religious, or political considerations, his name is invested with a peculiar interest. A thoughtful intellectual man, working under the fetters of a system powerful enough to subjugate him practically to its sway, but not sufficiently strong to repress altogether the more generous and liberal aspirations of his nature, must be an object of interest at any era, and in any circumstances; but more especially when he is called to act at one time in obscurity and exile, under the depressing influence of neglect and poverty, and at another in affluence and honour, flushed with enthusiastic hope, and cheered by unwonted, and perhaps temporary, popularity. Such has been the chequered history of GIOBERTI: and if we advert, in the first instance, to the incidents of his eventful life, it is for the purpose of illustrating, and placing clearly before our readers, the practical operation of those principles which he avows in his writings, and which afford, we think, a very sufficient, if not altogether a satisfactory account, of the course of procedure which he has pursued in connexion with the stirring events with which his name is now indissolubly associated in the history of Europe.

GIOBERTI was born in Piedmont about the commencement of the present century; in 1831, he was chaplain to the King at the Sardinian Court, and Theological Professor in the University at Turin; in 1833, political causes which have not been fully explained, occasioned his exile from his native country, without, however, subjecting his conduct to any process of judicial investigation, or himself to any criminal sentence; he remained for a time at Paris, and afterwards retired to Brussels, where for twelve years he exercised the humble duties of a public teacher in a Seminary, while he enjoyed what was to him the invaluable privilege of access to libraries, and was enabled to prosecute with zeal his literary researches; he was afterwards permitted, and

even invited to return to his native country ; but, strong as his attachment was to the land of his birth, he declined to revisit it, in the then existing state of Italy ; his health, however, began to fail, and he found it necessary to retire from Brussels, and to repair to Paris, but by this time, he had by his writings obtained extensive celebrity in France, and Belgium, and even in Italy : and an arrangement was made, alike honourable to him, and creditable to the parties who spontaneously suggested it, whereby forty admirers of his genius, including ecclesiastics, physicians, magistrates, notaries, barristers, and men of business, agreed to make him an annual allowance, sufficient to enable him to prosecute his studies without distraction, and to prepare his literary labours for the press. It was chiefly during his exile that he produced the works to which we shall have occasion to refer in the sequel of this Article ; but meanwhile, although the time has not arrived when any one could offer, with any well grounded confidence, either a detailed account of the events of his personal history, or a consistent explanation of the course of his public conduct, it may not be uninteresting in itself, and may, in some respects, subserve the practical object which we have in view, if we extract from contemporary journals, some of the more prominent incidents which have occurred in his chequered career, and which are now, more or less, mixed up with the great, the appalling events which have been passing before our eyes on the great theatre of Europe during the past unparalleled year.

GIOBERTI was living as an exile in Paris when the events of February 1848 gave a new impulse to the whole mind of Europe. He had written and published his sentiments, which were known far and wide before these events occurred. His passionate love for Italy, and its political independence ; his professed, and we believe sincere though mistaken, zeal for Catholicism ; his fearless opposition to infidel liberalism, and his equally dauntless opposition to monkish and jesuitical influence ; his personal character, his political leanings, and his literary reputation, all conspired to attract towards him the thoughts and affections of those who, moved by the stirring events of France, began at length to hope for what many had long eagerly desired, the civil liberation of Italy, while they had as yet no very distinct or definite conceptions of the kind of liberty which alone could secure the prosperity of their beautiful but unfortunate country. Accordingly, we find the following announcements occurring in rapid succession in the journals of the day ; announcements which may seem to be almost incredible, (were it not that they relate to a revolutionary crisis,) since they describe the rapid ascent of a recluse and depressed student, living in exile and poverty, to a position of all but regal power in his own coun-

try; and which may also seem to be somewhat contradictory, since they describe the popularity and applause with which he was welcomed, and, at the same time, exhibit the sad reverse, were it not again that they relate to fluctuations of popular sentiment which, at such a crisis, may occur as rapidly and unexpectedly as the events which gave them birth.

*May 6, 1848.**—The elections commenced on the 26th ult. in Piedmont. Among the deputies nominated at Turin, are the President of the Council, Cæsar Balbo, and the celebrated Vincent Gioberti, one of the principal chiefs of the party who desire to unite Italy. GIOBERTI set out on the 24th from Paris, where he was an exile, and was brilliantly received at Turin.

July 29.—When the Chamber at Turin was engaged in discussing the law relative to religious corporations, the clause expelling the Jesuits occasioned some slight opposition; but an ecclesiastic, deputy from Coni, ascended the tribune, and in a most eloquent and energetic speech, pronounced a panegyric on GIOBERTI, and held up the Jesuits and their votaries to public execration. The feeling against this Society appears universal throughout Italy. A decree was afterwards pronounced (6th September) by the Sardinian Government, banishing the Jesuits from the kingdom.

Sept. 6.—The inhabitants of Turin are signing a proposition of GIOBERTI, to centre the dictatorial power in the hands of three persons possessing the confidence of the people.

Oct. 18.—At the first sitting of the Federal Congress at Turin, Andrea Romeo, VINCENT GIOBERTI, and Terenzio Mamiani, were elected Presidents amidst enthusiastic applause. Perez of Palermo and Lucien Buonaparte were chosen Vice-presidents.

Oct. 21.—Incited by the patriots, at the head of whom is GIOBERTI, the Sardinian Cabinet has taken a decisive step towards the French Government, by declaring that if the negotiations relative to the Anglo-French mediation were not sufficiently advanced to lead to an expectation of an immediate and satisfactory result, Sardinia would resume the offensive against Austria. Lord Palmerston and M. Bastide intimate in consequence that they retire from the mediation.

Nov. 24.—The Pope quits Rome.

Déc. 13.—The members of the Sardinian Cabinet having resigned, the King summoned Count Lisis to form a new Ministry. Count Lisis is said to have refused, and to have added, that as his Majesty could not dissolve the Chamber of Deputies, under

* These notices have been extracted from the *Daily News*, the *Witness*, and other Journals of the date prefixed to each.

the existing grave circumstances, he must necessarily appoint GIOBERTI *President of the Council*, with power to choose a Ministry. The 'Concordia' of Turin, of the 6th instant, states, that a second popular demonstration had been made on that day. The mob, preceded by a tricolor flag, marched to the residence of M. GIOBERTI, and by the honours they rendered him, they appeared to salute him as the future *President of the Republic*.

Jan. 6, 1849.—The project of mediation may be regarded as abandoned. Austria only accepted the Congress on compulsion. The programme of GIOBERTI has served her for a pretext. GIOBERTI has said, that Sardinia would not discontinue her preparations for war. Austria has affected to see in this a kind of declaration of war.

Jan. 27.—An Envoy having been sent from Rome to Gaeta, and having been received by the Pope, but only in his private character, the Pope is said to have threatened, in the course of conversation, to recall his Ambassador from Turin, on account of a suspicion that the Sardinian Cabinet was in relations with the Roman Government.

Feb. 10.—The Club de la Rocca of Turin having charged a deputation to demand of the Ministry a prompt and full adhesion to the Italian Constituyente, M. GIOBERTI is said to have replied, that so long as he should be Minister, Piedmont should not send Deputies to the Constituyente at Rome.

Feb. 21.—In the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies at Turin on the 10th inst., the Minister, GIOBERTI, declared that he rejected as Utopian all the plans of those who desired to create a Unitarian and Republican Italy. A Republic would be only a hot-bed of divisions and dissensions in Italy, disunited during so many ages. His administration desired a strong and popular Monarchy; complete independence of the kingdom of Italy; a Federal Constituency; and a Diet representing all the States of the Peninsula.

March 17.—A fleet was reported to have sailed, and to have anchored off Civita Vecchia, with some thousand men on board, all eager to do battle in the Pope's behalf. It disappeared, and no more was heard of it. But an army was marched from Turin on the same pious errand; it turned out, however, that GIOBERTI had omitted to acquaint either his colleagues or the King, his master, with the fact of his having despatched such an expedition. He had planned an agreeable surprise, doubtless, for Charles Albert and his Cabinet, and hoped to be able to inform them some morning, without their having the least notion that he had an affair of such consequence in hands, that the Pope was once more seated in the Vatican; and that the affairs of Italy, which threatened to defy solution, and to bring so many

disasters in their train, were all amicably arranged. But the very best intentions sometimes miscarry; and the result of GIOBERTI'S plan surprised no one so much as himself. He did *not* restore the Pope to power; but he succeeded in precipitating himself from office.

March 17.—Concerning GIOBERTI:—three months—three little months—and the Hotel d'Angleterre conceived itself so honoured by having him for an inmate—passing as was the glory of his visit—that it placed a guard of honour, in compliment to him, at its door. The next street, catching “the soft infection,” was delighted to change its name, in consequence of its proximity, from Via Borgognona (which conveyed no other recollection to the passer by than that of an atrocious murder, committed in it some few years ago, by a woman of her husband, with the assistance of a priest) to VIA GIOBERTI. But, alas for the mutability of human things! already is the name crased,—covered with an ominous veil of black paint, and in its place is written, “GIOBERTI, *il Traditore d'Italia.*”

March 31.—The success of the Austrian arms was followed by the abdication and flight of Charles Albert, who resigned the Crown in favour of the Duke of Savoy. And, on the 29th March the latter, under the title of Victor Emmanuel, appointed Gioberti to the office of Secretary of State, without Portfolio, but holding, *pro tempore*, those of Public Works and Instruction.

April 7.—GIOBERTI was commissioned to go to Paris. It is announced that the object of M. GIOBERTI'S mission to Paris is to obtain the consent of the French Government to the intervention of the new King of Sardinia in Tuscany!

May 2.—The French squadron anchored at Civita Vecchia on the 26th ult., and disembarked on the following day. “It is affirmed to me by some of his friends, that M. GIOBERTI has been so far successful in his mission at Paris as to obtain, that the French expedition to the Roman States will take a prominent and active part in the settlement of the affairs of Central Italy, and will certainly advance to Bologna and Ferrara, and so be in a condition to menace the rear of the Austrian army, in case hostilities should commence in the course of the many complex questions which the situation of Lombardy, Piedmont, the Duchies of Parma, &c., of the Roman States, and of Venice, may create.

“The French squadron has arrived on the Italian coast, and taken possession of Civita Vecchia. *The real object of the expedition is still to some degree involved in mystery.* The force is a formidable one, and is about to be supplemented by additional corps. There can be no doubt that the equivocal movements of the Austrians, and the hard terms they are imposing in Pied-

mont, have at least as much to do with this expedition as the re-erection of the Papal Government at Rome. But, if the report be true, the greatest obstacle in the way of the return of the Pope to the Eternal City is the Pope himself. He will consent to be reinstated, it is said, only on condition that he shall enjoy his full absolute power. And though France is willing to restore him as a Spiritual Ruler, she is not yet prepared to restore him as a Temporal Sovereign. *Perhaps she may yet consent to go even this length."*

May 9.—De Launery is said to have resigned. GIOBERTI has been applied to, to accept of the Presidency of the Council; but the King is said to be personally opposed to him.

These notices, brief and cursory as they are, exhibit, better perhaps than a more elaborate description, a graphic picture of the career of this extraordinary man. He is first introduced to our notice as an exile, devoted to solitary study, and supporting himself by public teaching, while he is slowly but surely laying the foundation of a wide-spread celebrity. The scene changes; and the exile is recalled. The recluse student is summoned by the irresistible voice of patriotism to take his share in the labours and perils of the great struggle for liberty, and is welcomed with enthusiastic plaudits by the populace, while he secures the countenance and support of his lawful Sovereign. Again the scene changes; and within a few short months, the idol of the people is denounced as a traitor, and deprived of office, while his Prince, defeated and heart-broken, abdicates his sovereignty, and betakes himself to flight. But still GIOBERTI re-appears on the scene; he is recalled to the councils of the son and successor of Charles Albert. We obtain a glimpse of him; or at least we see his shadow, as he passes from Turin to Paris; and soon after the French squadron leaves Toulon and anchors on the coast of Italy. His influence survives even after the ebullition of popular resentment, and the temporary loss of office; and perhaps at this hour the question which agitates the whole of Europe respecting the future fate of Rome and the settlement of Italy, may be determined in a great measure by the councils and plans which GIOBERTI suggested to the Government of France.

In such circumstances, it may not be uninteresting to consider the questions that are naturally suggested by these incidents in his personal history: First, what estimate we should form of his character as a patriot and friend of liberty; and secondly, what expectation we should cherish as to the probable tendency and issue of his counsels in regard to the future fate of the Pope. These questions can only be satisfactorily answered by referring to his recorded opinions—opinions published long before the occurrence of the startling events to which we have referred, and

avowed with fearless intrepidity at a time when there was little prospect of any other reward for their author than a continued exile, and general opposition on the part both of liberals and bigots. It is not unlikely that the events to which we have referred may be quoted as evidence against him, as if he were not sincere or not trustworthy; seeing that, in apparent opposition to all his liberal professions, he is seen to be an active friend of the Pope, and the advocate of foreign intervention. It would not even surprise us to find him branded by others besides the mob of Turin, as a traitor to the cause of liberty, or quoted as an apposite proof of the proverb so generally current among a certain class of liberals, that the clergy are not to be trusted—that no faith must be reposed in a priest. We are not advocates of the Romish Priesthood; nor are we even, in the slightest degree, disposed to become the partizans of Gioberti;—but in public questions, we would have justice done to all parties, however much we may differ from them, or they from us; and it is our deliberate conviction, that the friends of constitutional liberty in Europe need to be warned that there are other principles besides perfidy to which the conduct of such a man as Gioberti may, and ought to be ascribed; principles which are only the more tenaciously held in proportion as they are vigorously assailed, and which may be maintained and acted on in perfect consistency with personal honour, although not without injury or peril to the public cause. It may, we think, be satisfactorily proved that the principles which Gioberti had fearlessly avowed, and eloquently defended in his various writings long before the occurrence of those events which summoned him into the arena of political life, have only found a consistent practical development in the course of his public conduct; and that those who have expressed disappointment and dissatisfaction with his policy, and branded him as a traitor to the cause of liberty, have less reason to charge *him* with perfidy, than to blame *themselves* for expecting him to act in direct opposition to his avowed and most cherished convictions. And the lesson, although dearly bought, may perhaps be found to be worth all the price that has been paid for it, should it lead the friends of constitutional liberty to reflect somewhat more profoundly than many of them have been wont to do, on the necessary conditions and fundamental principles of the great problem which they are so eager to solve,—to investigate, especially, the indissoluble connexion, and manifold relations subsisting between religious and political freedom,—to discriminate aright between the respective provinces and functions of the spiritual and temporal authorities,—and to see that there is, and can be, no effectual security either for national or personal freedom that is not based on the general prevalence of

enlightened views respecting some topics which in theory are too often neglected by politicians on the plea that they belong to the domain of theology; but which are found in practice to exert a powerful influence on the public policy of the world. Were any one to charge Gioberti with having acted either an inconsistent or dishonourable part, he might, we think, fall back on his published writings, and draw from them the materials of an ample personal vindication. He had avowed himself, indeed, as an ardent friend of liberty, and especially as a strenuous advocate for the national independence of Italy. His undisguised hatred of Austrian domination, combined with his high talents and literary celebrity, gave him a foremost place among the band of patriots who longed for the emancipation of their native land; and we can well conceive how the heart of the restored exile would swell when he took his place among the popular Deputies at Turin, and was received with enthusiastic applause. But it was equally true, and he had never disguised his sentiments, that from the first he had avowed his utter want of sympathy for the Republican spirit, his dislike to Republican institutions, his decided preference for constitutional Monarchy, his devoted attachment to the See of Rome, and his inflexible determination to subordinate not only his politics, but his philosophy itself, to the authority of the Infallible Church. That he was both sincere and ardent in his detestation of the Austrian yoke, and in his professed regard for the political emancipation of Italy, is sufficiently proved, we think, by his resolute declaration that Sardinia would not discontinue her preparations for war; by his firmness in withstanding every representation whether of the French or English Government, at a time when there was apparently little ground to expect the success of the Piedmontese in such a struggle, except what they might find in their own valour; and by his constant adherence to the same policy in the face of all the perils by which his king and country were threatened,—he cannot be justly charged, so far as we know, with having deserted or betrayed the popular cause, or abandoned any one position which he had undertaken to defend. He had more than once denounced the Jesuits, as being, equally with Austria, foes to the public liberty; and by the publication of his remarkable work, "*Del Primato Morale et Civile degli Italiani*," he had not only arrayed against himself the members of that formidable society, but even forfeited the friendship of some of his most intimate associates.* "Is not the foreigner," he had

* Silvio Pellico, and his brother Francesco Pellico, Father Curci, Giuseppe Romano, and Luigi Taparelli, are mentioned among his numerous assailants on this occasion.

said, "the great enemy of the Italian people and their princes? Undoubtedly; and it is precisely for that reason that the Jesuits are so much to be dreaded,—who, present everywhere, yet being subjects nowhere, are most emphatically foreigners in Italy." "Is it surprising that Austria and the Society have become friends and allies,—they whose object is one, and who mutually assist in attaining it? That object, common to both, is to weaken and divide the Peninsula, in order the more effectually to place it under their yoke, and twist their chains around it." "As it is evident that this faction, which cannot dispense with the authority and support of barbarous rulers, is the principal cause of the miseries of Italy,—so every sincere and devoted friend to our common country ought, resolutely, and without one individual remaining in the background, to arise in opposition against it." The best comment on these emphatic words is to be found in the fact that the Sardinian Government published a decree banishing the Jesuits from the kingdom. In so far, therefore, as the Austrians and Jesuits are concerned, no suspicion can rest on the sincerity and consistency of Gioberti. But as the crisis became more violent, there may seem, at first sight, to be some symptoms of vacillation in his conduct, if not of reaction against his professed principles. Did he not betray somewhat of an aristocratic spirit, when he proposed to centre the dictatorial power in the hands of three persons possessing the confidence of the people? Did he not return an answer to the Club de la Rocca at Turin, strongly expressive of his determination not to fraternize with the Italian Constituyente, thus severing himself from the free brotherhood at Rome? Did he not declare in the Chamber of Deputies against the creation of a Republic in Italy as a Utopian dream? and did he not affirm his determination to maintain a strong and popular Monarchy? Did he not make an attempt, which success might have dubbed chivalrous and heroic, but which, having proved abortive, has exposed him to the shafts of ridicule, to reinstate the Pope by the power of the Sardinian army, risking, and actually forfeiting office in the pursuit of this darling object, and thereby showing his sympathy and zeal for the sacred See? Did he not repair to Paris and obtain the intervention of the French Republic for the same end? and if, by the joint efforts of France and Austria, the Roman liberties shall be suppressed, and the ancient régime restored, to whom, if not to Gioberti, will the credit or scandal of that change belong? All this is true, and more; there is evidence, we think, to show that Gioberti, zealous as he is for the political emancipation of his country from Austrian domination, has yet very imperfect ideas of civil liberty; that his prevailing leanings are aristocratic rather than democratic; and that he views with con-

tempt and scorn many of the speculations and plans which the more ultra-liberals have propounded.* Add to this that he is a zealous Roman Catholic—a devoted son of the Church—a stern defender of St. Peter's chair,—and we shall find little cause for wonder, and none whatever for any dishonourable personal imputation, in the course which he has pursued. For his principles on all these points had been often and openly proclaimed; he had avowed them in days of exile, and neglect, and poverty; he was prepared to act upon them when the proper time for action came; and now that the time for action has at length arrived, disappointed and dissatisfied as many of his quondam associates may be with his conduct, they cannot, we think, fasten upon him the charge of treachery, although they may have reason enough to bewail the consequences to the sacred cause of liberty, which may result from his policy. The question whether that policy be or be not consistent with his avowed principles is widely different from another and much more important question—whether these principles and that policy be, or be not, consistent with the sacred cause of freedom; the former can only be determined by a reference to his professed opinions, as these have been long before the world in his published writings, which are sufficient, we think, to vindicate him from every dishonourable personal imputation; but the latter must be determined on other and more

* Many incidental expressions confirm this remark. He speaks of "Ce qui arrive des sociétés civiles, où la raison des sages est mise de côté, pour faire place au caprice de la multitude." "J'ai grande confiance dans la puissance du génie Italien, je veux dire du *petit nombre*, car la foule est, en Italie comme ailleurs, pareille aux moutons qui marchent en aveugles, serrés les uns contre les autres, sans s'inquiéter si le chemin qu'ils ont pris mène au but ou au précipice." "L'élément plébéien domine dans toutes les parties de la vie civile; les médiocrités, les nullités ont le pouvoir; et de même que dans certaines républiques du moyen-âge, les nobles étaient seuls exclus des charges politiques, de même aujourd'hui, il arrive bien souvent que le mérite éminent seul est éloigné des affaires, et privé des honneurs et des avantages de la société. C'est ce qu'on rencontre même dans les pays gouvernés par des rois; de là on peut conjecturer ce que arriverait, si la plèbe parvenait à être la maîtresse dans le gouvernement, si la démocratie pure s'établissait comme le veulent une foule des gens qui professent un grand amour pour les progrès de la civilisation et pour le bonheur de notre espèce. Si les démagogues l'emportent, l'Europe aura le sort de l'ancienne Italie et de l'ancienne Grèce; la liberté et la civilisation seront détruites dans la racine, parceque l'esprit de la plèbe est sensuel et violent, c'est-à-dire, *tyrannique et barbare*. Pour prévenir cette ruine éminente il n'y a pas d'autre remède opportun que de reconnaître et d'organiser l'ARISTOCRATIE NATURELLE selon l'idée primitive; et pour cela, il faut faire prédominer le principe aristocratique bien entendu, dans la religion, &c. C'est justement sur l'idée Catholique que doit se baser quiconque veut faire refluer le principe de l'aristocratie élective dans les divers ordres de la société humaine, sans se perdre dans les Utopies et les chimères. Qu'on affranchisse l'Europe civilisée de l'empire inepte de la multitude; qu'on reconnaisse que c'est aux véritables nobles, c'est-à-dire, au petit nombre des meilleurs d'entre les hommes qu'appartient en tout la direction des choses humaines; et l'on aura fait beaucoup pour la multitude elle-même; car grossière et misérable, elle ne peut être améliorée et civilisée que par ceux qui possèdent les biens qui lui manquent."

general grounds, by a reference to the real import and right application of certain great principles, bearing directly on the relations subsisting between the temporal and spiritual powers, and especially on the claims and prerogatives of the Romish Sec. Should it be found that, in the opinion of its most enlightened and liberal defenders, the Papacy involves an element that is in direct antagonism with the civil and religious liberties of mankind, and that this is the real and, perhaps, insurmountable obstacle to the political independence and social improvement of the Italian States, surely it may be expected that considerate statesmen will at length open their eyes to the magnitude and importance of those theological questions which they have been hitherto so anxious to *ignore*; and that they will seriously grapple with them as problems which must be solved, and solved, too, on sure scriptural grounds, before the liberties of Europe can be placed on a secure and permanent basis. We are not ignorant that the Romish Church has a wonderful facility in adapting itself to every change in the political state of the various countries in which it has obtained a footing; that Romish Ecclesiastics mingled with the revolutionary mob of Paris, and blessed the "trees of liberty;" that some have even taken part in the banquets of Socialism, and striven to lead a movement which otherwise they might have failed to control; nor are we unmindful that several of the most influential writers of that persuasion have given forth the general maxim that, "when an established Government is recognised by the various powers of the nation and by neighbouring States, it ought to be held legitimate, whatever vice may attach to its origin:"—and hence the legitimists in France are severely censured by Gioberti for raising any question as to the title of the reigning family. It has, indeed, become quite the fashion with a certain class of Romish writers to set forth the perfect compatibility of Popery with the existence of free popular Institutions, and even with Republican equality.* But on this subject the *experimentum crucis* is about to be made; it remains to be seen whether those principles apply to—the subjects of the Pope! It is com-

* For example :—"L'Eglise rappelle continuellement aux peuples, la nécessité d'un pouvoir législatif et administratif, la source divine de ce pouvoir souverain et la sainteté de sa mission. Mais ces maximes ont également leur application dans les états démocratiques, dans les états Monarchiques, dans les états Mixtes, en un mot dans toute société régulièrement établie. L'Eglise rappelle aussi . . . que tout peuple possède naturellement le droit inaliénable d'être gouverné de la manière la mieux appropriée à ses intérêts et à ses besoins. Voilà pourquoi les Catholiques peuvent être, sans nulle contradiction, Républicains dans les Cantons Suisses et aux Etats-Unis, Constitutionnelles en Angleterre," &c.—ABBE DE VALMORÉ, *Etudes Critiques sur le Rationalisme contemporain*, 1846, pp. 604.

paratively an easy task to make out a plausible case in regard to the members of the Romish communion scattered throughout the other States of Europe, where they are exempted from the temporal sway of the Roman Pontiff, and subject only to his spiritual authority—although even in their case there may be good ground for alleging, as our forefathers did allege, that there was danger to the cause of liberty in their divided allegiance, owing to the intimate relation subsisting between the spiritual and temporal powers. But it will be a much more difficult task to prove that free civil Institutions may flourish under the shade of the Vatican, and that either a Constitutional Monarchy or a free Republic can consist with the claims of St. Peter's chair within the States of the Church itself. Will it be admitted, with regard to the subjects of these States—the only subjects over whom the Pope can exercise his full power—that they are entitled to the fair application of Valroger's maxim, “Que tout peuple possède naturellement le droit inamissible d'être gouverné de la manière la mieux appropriée à ses intérêts et à ses besoins ?” Or suppose that there should still continue to be, as there has hitherto been, a difference of opinion between the people and the Pope as to the method of Government which is best adapted to their interests and wants, will it be contended that, on this subject, the Pope's authority must overrule the popular voice, or will it be conceded that the Roman citizens have the same right to dethrone their temporal sovereign and to inaugurate a new constitution, which is recognised in the citizens of Paris? *Nous verrons*; but meanwhile, the difficulty is strongly felt; and it arises wholly from the union of the secular and spiritual power in the hands of the Pope. PIO NONO has himself acknowledged it, when he said, with equal simplicity and truth, that in the case of a mere temporal sovereignty nothing could be more simple than to change the form of Government; but that in the case of the Romish Pontiff, it was necessary to take time for deliberation, since the temporal and spiritual power being combined in his person, it must be regarded as a case *sui generis*, and dealt with *per se*. And the only reply that has yet been offered to the bold demand of the Red Republicans—Why, if France and Austria are entitled to put down the popular Government of Rome, it ought not equally to be held that Russia or England was entitled to suppress the popular Government of Paris?—is one to this effect, that Rome being the centre of Christendom, all the nations of Europe have an interest, and consequently a right to interfere in the settlement of its form of Government; and that the native citizens, the born subjects of the Pope, are not entitled, as other citizens and subjects may be, to remodel their institutions according to their own pleasure;—a reply which may be found in effect

to amount to this—that, for the general good of Christendom, the inhabitants of Rome must continue to wear their shackles, while all other States are springing into political freedom; and that they must console themselves, as best they may, with the privilege of being the helots of Europe, because the system to which they are inevitably *thirled* does not admit of their political enfranchisement.

We are still speculating in the dark and at a venture on topics which may be cleared up by the progress of events in a few short months. But if we would form a probable conjecture of the issue of the movements already begun, with reference to the influences which originated and directed them, we can have no difficulty in ascertaining what will be the aim of GIOBERTI and his associates, or what will be the practical result, unless they are compelled to bend before the force of some uncontrollable necessity. *The restoration of the Pope in the full plenitude of his spiritual authority as the Visible Head of the Catholic Church, and his restoration also to the temporal powers and prerogatives of his Monarchy, as head of the Roman States,* are the objects which, in perfect consistency with their avowed principles, they will steadfastly pursue; and popular rights and privileges will be respected only in so far as they do not really conflict, or may be made at least apparently to harmonize, with the ascendancy of the Papal power. With all his popular leanings, GIOBERTI is, and ever has been, a sturdy, bold, and uncompromising adherent of the Infallible Church. He is described by his French editors as a theologian profoundly attached to the orthodox faith, “*passionné, comme l’a dit Silvio Pellico, pour l’Eglise et pour la liberté;*” and what his notions are, both of the Church and of liberty, may be gathered from his own emphatic words—“*Truth is in itself one, immutable, indivisible; Catholicism, the perfection of moral and religious truth, has the same attributes, so that nothing can be taken from it, nothing added to it, without destroying it. He who believes with entire faith in the teachings of the Church, one article excepted, is no more a Catholic than another who rejects the whole; you may say he is not so far removed from Catholicism as the other, but you cannot call him a Catholic without destroying Catholicism. The essence of Catholicism consists in acknowledging the absolute supremacy of the Church in the definition of moral and religious truth, a supremacy which one annihilates by changing it in the smallest possible respect (pour la plus petite partie possible) as well as in denying it altogether.*” “*I hold the Catholic religion to be, not only a respectable doctrine, as the condescension of modern eclectics ignorantly calls it, but to be the only doctrine which has really any scientific validity in matters of speculation; the only*

philosophical doctrine that has power to promote the progress of civilisation. And far from believing the principles of the old theology to be out of date, withered, or stale, I hold them to be more full of growth, freshness, and fecundity, than the theories which date from the year when the author published them. A return to Catholic belief throughout the whole civilized world appears, even humanly speaking, indubitable. Religious eclecticism, theological rationalism, humanitarian Christianity, and other chimeras of the same kind, devoid of all solid foundation, will disappear with the *prestige* of novelty which attended their first introduction, and will have no more importance or renown than the dreams of the Cabalists and Gnostics." "I will believe in the accomplishment of the civil redemption of Italy, when I shall see her—*Catholic*, and proud to possess the See of Religion and the glory of the Christian pontificate. As long as they revered the majesty of the Senate, the ancient Romans were free at home, and abroad masters of the world; but from the time when they began to despise that civil paternity, they fell under the imperial yoke, only to pass from it under the yoke of barbarians. The Italians of the Middle Age saw everything flourishing—liberty, commerce, arts, letters, arms; and they were illustrious as long as they bowed before the spiritual paternity of the first citizen of Italy (la paternité spirituelle du premier citoyen de l'Italie); but when they began to despise him, slavery came on them." "The salvation of Italy cannot come elsewhere than from Rome. By an eternal decree of Providence, Rome has received for its portion to be the metropolis and mistress of the world (d'être la métropole et la dominatrice du monde.) The ancient republic, the ancient empire paved the way for the cosmopolitan unity of the Pontificate (à l'unité cosmopolite du pontificat.) He who cannot apprehend this great truth has no eyes for the reading of history. But know you on what the power of Rome depends, even in such affairs? It depends on the obedience of her children. Crescenza, Arnaldo da Brescia, Nicolas de Lorenzo, F. Baroncelli, Etienne Porcari, wished to effect the restoration of Rome by reviving a phantom of Pagan liberty, and they perished. Nor could their attempt have any other issue: to restore Rome Christian by reviving the Institutions of Paganism was a too enormous anachronism. Would you unite Italy? would you extricate it alike from the distractions of internal tyranny and the ignominy of a foreign yoke? Deliver it from the yoke of false opinions; reunite it in the profession of the holy faith; begin by rejecting the mad theories of a licentious liberty, the mother of despotism, theories which sprung from the rebellion of Luther, (de la révolte de Luther), and which have grown under the culture of English and French

sophists. If you consecrate these fatal doctrines, (ces funestes doctrines), instead of overthrowing and extirpating them, (au lieu de les abattre et de les déraciner), can you wonder if the authority which is the conservatrix of the truth be hostile to your designs? The redemption of Italy, I repeat, must come principally from that faith which has its supreme seat at Rome. But if it be thought that it must come from Paris, and that we must import from thence those pure ideas which are to nourish the intelligence and taste of Italy, our infamy will be eternal (notre infamie sera éternelle)." But his views are not confined to the States of the Church, or even to the States of Italy: he seems to cherish a far nobler vision—the vision of a Universal Monarchy, having its seat at Rome, and its affiliated but subordinate monarchies in all lands, which shall substitute the Paternal for the Feudal element all the world over, and unite the human family in one bond of brotherhood, so as to restore the unity of the race itself! The Papacy is spoken of as the rival and antagonist of the empire (l'empire), and the beneficial influences of the former (les bienfaisantes influences de la papauté) are contrasted with the evils engendered by the latter, and the vicious institutions which it maintained. The empire is regarded as being in one respect the personification of Pagan unity, and as becoming a fertile cause of discord in the Christian world, by its opposition to the pontificate, which ought to hold its place, and which would have filled it better, in proportion as *right* is more noble and more fruitful than *might*. "The empire, restored by Charlemagne, was a dangerous privilege to France, and afterwards a misfortune to Germany, since it perpetuated the principle of national independence, and prevented that unity which can only be produced by the organizing power of the Catholic hierarchy, (la force organisatrice de la hiérarchie Catholique.) If the empire had not found a restorer, the FEUDAL system would not have been so tenacious, and Germany would have been one, like France. Nay, the unity of Europe, and the ultimate unity of the whole world, depends on the recognition of the Pope and the Catholic hierarchy! The political unity which succeeded the feudal and municipal subdivisions at the beginning of the sixteenth century, was obtained at the expense of liberty and independence:—this unity would have been a bundle of free institutions, (un faisceau d'institutions libres,) had it been the work of the Popes; but it occasioned division, because it was the work of kings. But Italy has retained her glorious pre-eminence. Italian nationality has one peculiar and exclusive privilege. It consists in this, that absolute truth is an intrinsic possession of Italy as a nation. The Catholic religion, as true, ought to be dear to every people; but

to us Italians, it ought to be dear and precious, for two reasons ; as it is true, and as it is national. The Catholic religion is ours in a special manner. It is ours, because Italy received it at its birth, and was the chief instrument in developing and spreading it over the world, barbarous and civilized ;—it is ours, because it reigns over the whole Peninsula, where dissenting worship scarcely exists, if at all ;—it is ours, above all, because we possess the supreme See of its priesthood, because we owe to that See the glory of having amongst us the religious capital of the universe, and of seeing the Roman greatness restored, without the tears and the blood of the people. I know that, by a deplorable infatuation, a party among the civilized Italians are unwilling to understand these truths ; I know that many regard that as a burden, some even (O madness !) as a disgrace to the common country, which constitutes its highest glory.” “ For it is not Italy alone ; it is the whole world that has an interest in this question. The unity of the race was destroyed by the Fall, and its miserable division consummated at Babel ; but unity was destined to be restored by Divine interposition ; a commencement was made with the family of Abraham, and a more Catholic system introduced by the Saviour, when he instituted a Church and a hierarchy, *sous un chef unique et suprême* ; and the Catholic hierarchy being the only organism which, by its successive development and expansion, can produce the moral unity of the human race, its visible head is the organic principle on which depends the future unity of the world. The pontifical authority, therefore, is the spiritual and elective paternity which is necessary to form the unity of the great human family, just as natural paternity forms the unity of particular families ; and it follows that Italy, which contains within its bosom the chief of the moral unity of the world, is the mother-nation of the human race.” (*La nation mère du genre humain.*)

These singular extracts can leave no reasonable doubt as to the policy of GIOBERTI and his associates in regard to the question of the Pope's restoration ; and we are not sure that, after such an explicit avowal of their sentiments, they could justly be taxed with perfidy to the liberal cause, even should they consent to measures which will leave little more than the semblance of free institutions at Rome. It is true, that the strong language in which Gioberti censures the legitimists of France for disturbing the peace of an established government, and the still stronger language in which he condemns the attempts of some priests in Spain, might furnish materials for a cutting retort on the part of the Roman Republicans. They might say that—The Pope has been deposed as lawfully as were Charles Dix and Louis Phi-

lippe;—that a regular government has been instituted by the popular will;—and that it is just as unlawful for the partizans of the Pope to create disturbance in Rome now, as Gioberti said it was in the legitimists at Paris. But it is replied, that there are two peculiarities in the case of Rome which exempt it from the application of such principles; the first is, that the Pope is, either *jure divino*, as some say, or at least, as others maintain, by *le droit publique*, the Head of the Universal Church, and as such, the supreme head of the Roman Government; and the second is, that Italy, possessing the peculiar and exclusive privilege of being the seat of the Pope's residence, must be even more than other nations subject to the interposition of external authority; for, although in all common cases, the maxim of Abbé Valroger may be admitted,—“que tout peuple possède naturellement le droit inamissible d'être gouverné de la manière la mieux appropriée à ses intérêts et à ses besoins;” yet in the peculiar case of Italy it is necessary to apply the more guarded maxim of *Gioberti*, and to give full effect to its restrictive clauses,—“quand un gouvernement établi est reconnu par les différents pouvoirs de la nation, et l'ensemble des autres peuples civilisés et Chrétiens, il est en tout point légitime—quelqu'ait pu être le vice de son origine.” The Roman Republic is supported by the general consent of the citizens; but it is not recognised by Austria, and France, and other States: its legitimacy, therefore, is not fully proved, while the Pope is the lawful successor of St. Peter, the Supreme Head of the Infallible Church!

The writings which constitute the groundwork of *Gioberti's* celebrity, and which were chiefly instrumental in raising him to political influence, may be described generally as a *mélange* of literary, philosophical, and theological speculation, all animated by the same spirit, and directed to one common end. In early life he published his “*Teorica del Sovrannaturale*,” a treatise written in Italian, and devoted to the discussion of those questions in Philosophy which are most intimately connected with religion, but afterwards translated and reprinted at Brussels under the title of “*Théorie du Surnaturel*.” It was followed in succession by a work, in 3 vols., “*Degli errori Filosofici di Antonio Rosmini*,” by a treatise “*del Buono*,” and another “*del Bello*,” by a dissertation, entitled “*del Primato morale et civile degli Italiani*,” and by the work which we have placed at the head of our Article, which contains a full development of his philosophical opinions, as well as his “*Considérations sur les Doctrines Religieuses de M. Victor Cousin*,” which are inserted as an appendix in the third volume.

The work to which we propose to dedicate our remaining

space bears, as its general title, the somewhat grandiloquent inscription of "Restauration des Sciences Philosophiques ;"* but is more correctly, as well as more modestly, described in the second title as an "Introduction à l'Etude de la Philosophie." It is a translation into French from the second Italian edition, published at Brussels in 1844, and is executed by two Abbés of the Romish Communion and Co-Professors at Rheims—the Abbé Tourneur, and the Abbé Defourney. In a sensible preface, written by the translators, some account is given of GIOBERTI, and of the estimation in which he is held, which is followed, as is usual in France, with an *aperçu* of his system. They tell us, that in republishing his Philosophical and Theological Speculations, they conceive themselves to have rendered an important service to the cause both of science and of religion : to the former, because these speculations are so new and so beautiful, that, whether received or rejected, they must influence, to a large extent, the current and direction of philosophical thought in Europe ; and to the latter, because they constitute one of the most solid and serious apologies for Divine truth—and are, in short, a complete arsenal, richly furnished with all needful weapons for overthrowing (*abattre en brèche*) Pantheism, Scepticism, and Rationalism, which are described as the chief, or rather, the only heresies of the present age. The publication of a work devoted to the Restoration of Philosophy is held to be, if somewhat bold and apparently presumptuous, yet highly reasonable, and, in fact, urgently required ; partly because the philosophy of Germany, radically defective in principle, can avoid utter Scepticism only by falling into Pantheism or Atheism ; partly because the philosophy of France, as represented by the Eclectic and Humanitarian Schools, is either a mere derivative from the German, or, in so far as it has any original character, is continually fluctuating and eminently dangerous : while the philosophy of Scotland (*la philosophie Écossaise*), although successful so far, as serving to shed a clear light over many of the obscure problems of Psychology, has been all but stationary since the days of Reid and Stewart. The philosophy of reason (*la philosophie rationaliste*) is brought into contrast with another and a very different system, the philosophy of the Church (*la philosophie Catholique*) : and Gioberti is described as one of the ablest opponents of the former, one of the most successful advocates of the latter ; while, with characteristic caution, the French Abbés are careful to add—that in giving their commendation to

* This title does not occur in the Italian edition published at Lausanne in 1846, and may have been added by the French editors. The Italian edition has just come into our hands ; and from a somewhat rapid inspection of it, we are satisfied that the French version is generally accurate and trustworthy.

the work, they are far from affirming that every thing contained in it is true; Gioberti himself having apprised us that there is no philosophical system which does not involve some error, "*et que l'Infaillibilité est un privilège exclusif de l'Eglise Catholique*:" a statement which irresistibly recalls the celebrated "*Declaratio*" of Le Seur and Jacquier, the Romish editors of Newton's *Principia*—"Newtonus in hoc tertio libro, Telluris motæ hypothesim assumit. Autoris Propositiones aliter explicari non poterant, nisi eâdem quoque factâ hypothesi. Hinc alienam coacti sumus gerere personam. Cæterum latis a summis Pontificibus contra Telluris motum Decretis, nos obsequi profitemur!"*

GIOBERTI has characterized his own work as "*un Nouveau Système Philosophique*;" but if the British reader, accustomed to the systematic treatment of science, shall expect to find in it any thing bearing the slightest resemblance to the scientific works of his own country; to the patient analytic of Locke, or the profound practical wisdom of Reid, or the polished refinement of Stewart, or the subtle eloquence of Brown, or the masculine vigour of Macintosh, or the calm reflection of Abercrombie, he will be greatly disappointed: and yet there is a breadth of view, and, on some points, a profound insight, which sufficiently evince the existence of a genius for philosophical speculation; and these, combined with a vivid perception of the radical defects of certain modern systems, and a graphic power of delineating their most prominent features, in a bold, fearless, and *tranchant* style, constitute the peculiar charm of the volumes before us. Certain principles, directly opposed to the systems now in vogue, are here and there presented, not as in the calm, clear light of day, but as in the blaze of a lightning-flash; we seem to see them for a moment clothed in vivid brightness, but instantly we are reminded of the "darkness visible." Still, the "*Restauration des Sciences Philosophiques*," by Gioberti, has some resemblance to the "*Instauratio Magna*" of Francis Bacon; in this respect, that as the latter dealt largely in criticism on the past history and the then present state of philosophical speculation, and sought to emancipate the human mind from the bondage of scholastic forms, so the former is at least as profuse in its criticism, and as condemnatory in its tone, of the post-Baconian systems, and seeks to emancipate the human mind from the fetters of Rationalistic formulæ, in order that it may enjoy the invaluable privilege of learning eternal truth at the lips of an Infallible Church. It is a vigorous and often eloquent specimen of that kind of reaction which might be expected to occur in the progress of

philosophical inquiry, when the *Inductive* is found to be at variance with the *Authoritative*, whether in matters of philosophy or of faith. And hence, in a great measure, arises the peculiar interest which belongs to it, as a work, written by a man of unquestionable genius, and of liberal views, but in defence of a system incompatible alike with individual and public freedom; a system which substitutes the authority of the Church for the authority of the Word, and disowns the right, or discourages the exercise of private judgment in matters of faith, as if God's own word were insufficient, without an infallible human interpreter, to guide our feet into the paths of peace.

By far the most striking passages in these volumes are those which are descriptive of the past history or present state of philosophy. And it might be interesting, did our limits admit of it, to extract some of the vivid pictures which he has drawn of men whose names are "familiar as household words" to all the lovers of speculative inquiry. His portraits of Descartes, Leibnitz, and Cousin; his delineations of Alfieri, Vico, and Galluppi; his estimate of Locke, Condillac, and Helvetius; his occasional references to Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin; above all, his graphic descriptions of German Rationalism, and French Eclecticism, with his withering exposure of the Progressiste or Humanitarian School, might be quoted as specimens of the power with which he portrays both the strong and the weak points of those with whom he is called to deal. But as he proposes a method of his own, antagonist in most respects to the prevailing spirit of the age, we shall devote the remainder of our space to a brief elucidation of its more prominent features, with a few remarks illustrative of the points at which it comes into collision with the philosophical and theological beliefs of our own highly favoured country.

We should grievously err did we suppose that the leaders of the Catholic party in Europe are either indifferent to the progress of philosophical speculation, or unable to advance at least a plausible explanation of the principles for which they contend. They have been called to maintain a close and almost unintermitted conflict with the infidel tendencies of the age. And we know few more instructive studies than that of the spectacle, sad and depressing in many of its aspects, which is presented to the thoughtful mind, when, surveying the present state of Europe, it singles out, for special consideration—such as well befits its transcendent importance—the battle, often renewed and still pending, between faith and unbelief. On the one side we see arrayed a motley and seemingly heterogeneous assemblage of men, all contending for the independence of reason, the rights of science, the progress of society, and the blessings of civilisa-

tion ; but in their camp there are ominous sounds of discord, and every detachment has its own party-coloured banner. On the other, we see a formidable power, darkly looming through the haze which envelops it, and the more impressive by reason of the very darkness which shades its boundaries ; often silent, always mysterious ; but when it does speak, using one cabalistic watchword, which summons every partizan to its standard, and rivets them, as with bolts of iron, to its cause ; while between the two, and doing battle alternately with both, there is a small but ill-organized body of serious, thoughtful, enlightened men, Bible Christians, who recoil alike from the reveries of Rationalism and the superstitions of Popery, and who refuse to resolve their faith either into the light of reason or the authority of tradition, while they submit with the docility of little children to the teaching of the Word and the Spirit of God. This small but select band, maintaining a constant conflict with each of the great antagonist powers of Evil, and bearing on its scroll the honoured names of Olshausen, Hengstenberg, D'Aubigné, Monod, Gasparin, Tholuck, and others, all more or less devoted to the cause of Christian truth, is at the present time the "forlorn hope" of Europe, and they deserve, as much as they need, the sympathy and prayers of their brethren in England. It is sad, deeply sad, to think that they are called to contend as strenuously against the nominal Protestantism, which in its Neological guise is akin to infidelity, as against the restless and growing power of Popery. It is still more sad to know, that, at the present moment, a larger portion of Bible truth, and a greater number of the cardinal articles of the Christian faith—including the doctrine of the fall, of original sin, of real supernatural interposition, of the inspiration of Scripture, of the incarnation, of the atonement, of the influence of the Spirit, and the historical truth of Christianity—may be found, although mixed up with many human inventions, in the creed of the Romish Church and the writings of her clergy, than any impartial eye can discern in the meagre and lifeless systems of some professed Protestants, insomuch that many a thoughtful mind might hesitate, were it reduced to the alternative of choosing, whether with the one to adhere to the historical faith of Christendom, corrupted though it be by many human additions, or to abjure that faith and all its blessed hopes for a cold and cheerless scepticism. Nor are the positive truths which the Popish party have retained, and which too many of the Protestants have abjured, the only elements of their strength ; they have amongst them men of splendid talents and vast acquirements, who have surveyed the whole field of science, mental, physical, and theological, with an eye ever wakeful and ever

intent on the one object to which their lives are devoted—the maintenance of the Catholic cause. With such men as Wiseman in England, Valroger in France, Baintain in Strasburg, and Gioberti in Italy, enlisted on her side, the Church of Rome will not fall without a vigorous struggle; and rather than surrender her arms she will fight on in the assured hope of ultimate victory, if she be assailed by no other weapons than such as Rationalism can furnish; for Rationalism, whether philosophical or religious, is no fit antagonist for Popery; the only weapon that can effectually destroy it is “the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.”

Rather than that the Church should suffer, modern science must be revolutionized: and so Gioberti aspires to be the Bacon of the nineteenth century. He proposes a radical reform in philosophy, and undertakes to prove its indispensable necessity, as well as to expound the principles on which it must proceed. And just as Bacon set aside the scholastic in order to introduce the inductive method, so Gioberti seeks to set aside the Rationalistic or heterodox, in order to establish the Ontological or Catholic philosophy. To show the urgent necessity of some such reform, he begins by establishing the startling proposition—“*qu'il n'y a plus aujourd'hui de philosophie en Europe,*” and by explaining the causes which have led to what he calls “*la nullité actuelle de la philosophie.*” His theory is, that Descartes and Luther—the one in philosophy, the other in theology—broke the chain of Catholic tradition, and were the real authors of that system which has prevailed during the last three centuries, and which is now producing its proper fruits, viz. Scepticism, Neology, and Pantheism. He admits that they might not be fully aware of the consequences which flowed inevitably from their avowed principles, and that the Reformers generally, (with the exception of Ulric Zwingle, whom he designates the first of modern Pantheists,) would have recoiled from many of the heresies which have sprung up among their followers in modern times: but he holds that these heresies were contained as a germ in the fundamental principles of their system, and that they are its natural and inevitable developments. Assigning to Descartes a prominent and not very enviable position, as the Head of Modern Heterodox Philosophy, he describes him as a Catholic in profession, and perhaps from prudence, but as a Protestant in spirit, and maintains that he borrowed his philosophical method from Luther; so that the Reformer was the real author of the prevailing Psychological systems.

“René Descartes, quoique français et Catholique de profession, était, par inclination et par principes, et peut-être sans le savoir, hété-

rodoxe.”—“La spéculation française fut, dès son principe, et dans la personne de son chef, *filie de Calvin*.”—“Descartes a emprunté sa méthode philosophique à Luther.”—“De ce que nous venons de dire, il sort une conséquence d’une très-haute importance, c’est que l’invention du psychologisme doit être attribuée à Luther plutôt qu’à Descartes. L’hérésiarche a jeté en terre le germe fatal, le philosophe français l’a développé.”—“De Luther et de Descartes sont nées la fausse philosophie et la théologie menteuse, deux fantômes monstrueux qui règnent maintenant partout où le principe Catholique est éteint ou languissant. La philosophie et la théologie moderne, nées d’une même méthode vicieuse, ont suivi une marche tellement analogue, je dirais même tellement parallèle, qu’elle mériterait d’être l’objet d’une étude spéciale. Toutes les fois que l’une fait un pas dans la funeste voie de l’erreur, l’autre en fait autant. Les égarements de l’une trouvent un écho dans les égarements de l’autre, et elle se répondent en tombant dans l’abîme. Sorties du néant, elles sont retournées au néant.”—“Cette science (la philosophie Catholique) après avoir heureusement traversé les siècles de barbarie, et dissipé par sa clarté les épais nuages, fut, ensuite obscurcie elle-même et enfin éteinte en Europe, *par l’opiniâtreté d’un Allemand et la folie d’un Français*.”

The fundamental error of the system, whose origin is thus traced up to the Reformation, is said to have been the substitution of the *sensible* (including under that term both “les sensibles spirituelles et internes,” and “les sensibles matériels et externes”) for the intelligible as the starting-point of philosophy; or more generally the substitution of Psychological reflection for reason, or of Psychologism for Ontology; as the principal, or, at least, primary instrument of philosophy. The “initial doubt” of Descartes, and the “private judgment” of Luther, are classed together as homogeneous elements of the same system which is supposed to have for its aim the impracticable task of founding a dogmatic faith on a sceptical basis. From the era of the Reformation till the present day, the inductive or experimental sciences have been rapidly advancing; while Philosophy, properly so called, which has for its object God, Man, and the World, has been retrograde: and the result is the almost universal prevalence of Psychologism and Sensism, the precursors and parents of Scepticism in Philosophy, and of Pantheism in Theology. In these circumstances, it is not wonderful if thoughtful and earnest men should put forth their strength to bring about a reaction against the prevailing system, and to supersede it by the substitution of another, more in accordance with the ancient methods, and with the teaching of the Church. Accordingly, Gioberti, with fearless intrepidity, throws himself into the breach, and calls aloud to his compatriots and allies to draw their swords and throw away their scabbards while they fight manfully for the philosophy which alone consists with the integrity of the

faith. His aim is a magnificent one—the restoration of European orthodoxy after three centuries of error and anarchy.

“Notre siècle est propre à cette œuvre sainte, et tous les hommes doués de haut génie et de grand cœur devraient y concourir, et consacrer tous leurs travaux au but sublime de *la restauration de l'orthodoxie Européenne, détruite depuis trois siècles.*” — “Il vous faudra défaire *l'œuvre de trois siècles*, et renouveler la situation morale de la société. La tâche est grande et glorieuse ; aussi exige-t-elle *une volonté de fer*, une indomptable résolution, d'immenses efforts.”

He compares the task which he has undertaken to that of Copernicus, when he revolutionized Astronomy.

“Le système du philosophe Allemand (E. Kant) répond en métaphysique à l'hypothèse de Ptolémée en Astronomie : tandis que celui dont nous nous faisons les renovateurs répond à la doctrine de Copernic. Dans l'un le centre de l'intelligible est l'homme, dans l'autre, c'est Dieu.”

In prosecution of this task, he proposes to reconstruct a Catholic and orthodox philosophy ; not that it is or should be sectarian, or distinct from that which is “the common heritage of civilisation ;” but it is so called, “parce qu'on la chercherait en vain hors de la Société Divine, privilégée de ce nom.” The Church and the Catholic Hierarchy are the sole depositaries of a sound philosophy, as well as of a sound faith.

“La philosophie est impossible, si elle n'est fondée et appuyée sur la religion ; celle-ci est la base, celle-là le toit de l'édifice. Luther, par sa rébellion, a déraciné les fondements, et les allemands, ses contemporains, furent bien coupables en se laissant entraîner par la déplorable faconde de ce moine forcené.” (i. 49.) — “La science ontologique, véritable substance de la philosophie, est perdue, et il est nécessaire de la refaire en entier, en empruntant les principes à *qui seul peut les donner.*” (P. 52.) — “Après une longue suite d'égarements, la fausse philosophie a expulsé l'idée de Dieu de la science humaine, et elle est devenue intrinsèquement et substantiellement athée, bien que ceux qui la cultivent de bonne foi parlent encore de Dieu à chacune de leurs pages. La vraie philosophie a pour but de *retrouver le Dieu scientifique*, de reconcilier, au moyen de la science, les esprits avec la religion, et on peut la définir, *la restauration de l'idée Divine dans la science.*” — “Dieu, qui parle intérieurement et naturellement, par son Verbe, à chaque individu, a parlé extérieurement et surnaturellement au genre humain tout entier. Et de même que la lumière intellectuelle est le milieu par lequel l'homme appréhende la manifestation naturelle du Verbe, de même l'Eglise est l'organe par lequel l'espèce humaine prend connaissance de la révélation, éminemment élevée au-dessus de l'ordre naturel. Il suit de là que l'autorité ecclésiastique est, par rapport aux vérités révélées, ce qu'est l'intelligible dans la sphère de la raison. En conséquence, le vrai génie est Chrétien et Catholique, la soumission du génie aux oracles de l'Eglise est sincère, profonde,

illimitée, parfaite." (P. 244.)—"L'Eglise Catholique est la société conservatrice et propagatrice de l'idée. La prérogative qui distingue le genre humain, selon l'ordre primitif, c'est l'infailibilité. L'infailibilité, considérée dans son principe, est objective; c'est l'impossibilité qu'a le vrai d'être faux; c'est l'identité nécessaire du vrai avec lui-même. Si l'ordre primitif s'était conservé intact, l'universalité des hommes aurait été exempte d'erreur, parceque l'idée l'aurait informée. Quand l'unité morale de l'espèce humaine cessa, avec elle périt le privilège qui en est une dérivation: l'infailibilité passa du genre naturel au genre élu."—"L'infailibilité devint une prérogative de cette grande société, dans le sein de laquelle l'idée renouvelée choisit son siège perpétuel et visible. Si l'Eglise est la réorganisation du genre humain, il suit delà que l'homme acatholique est dans un état excentrique, en dehors de sa condition naturelle, exclu moralement de sa propre espèce: il est, relativement à l'idée, un homme hors la loi, hors de la société, un sauvage; il correspond, dans l'ordre intellectuel, à ce que serait, dans l'ordre matériel, un homme nourri et élevé hors de toute société. La maxime, bien entendue, hors de l'Eglise point de salut, est souverainement rationnelle, puisque le salut est la vie de l'esprit et que la vie n'est ni imaginable, ni possible hors de l'idée, qui en est le principe. Toutes les fois que la Providence veut, par des voies extraordinaires et ignorées, communiquer la vérité à quelqu'un qui se trouve sans sa faute hors de la société élue, il est clair que cet individu, par le fait même de son initiation à la vérité, devient membre du corps auquel un privilège divin a confié la conservation intégrale du dépôt des vérités idéales."—P. 284.

We have offered these extracts as affording a sufficient illustration of the general aim and scope of Gioberti's scheme, in its relations to the past history and existing state of Philosophy in Europe. Before attempting to estimate its intrinsic merits or defects, we may be permitted to remark that it does appear somewhat strange at first sight, that Descartes, the acknowledged founder of modern Rationalism, should have been nevertheless a professed Catholic; while Leibnitz, who is claimed as one of the foremost advocates of the orthodox Philosophy, was an avowed Protestant: and furthermore, it is passing strange, and not very easily reconcilable with Gioberti's theory, that the French, who have perhaps been more thoroughly imbued than any other nation with the principles of Descartes and his successors, belong generally to the Infallible Church, while the German and the British, who are Protestant in profession, and who might therefore be expected to fall into the worst extremes of philosophical error, were for a considerable time and to a large extent, preserved from its infection. The fact is too palpable to have escaped the notice of such a man as Gioberti; and it is acknowledged by him, while it is attempted to be explained in accordance with his favourite theory. He admits that Descartes was

in profession a Catholic, but more than insinuates a doubt as to his sincerity ; he admits that Leibnitz was in profession a Protestant, but maintains that in spirit he was essentially Catholic ; he cannot deny that France, with its sensualism, its scepticism, its infidelity, its Pantheism, belongs, at least nominally, to the Catholic fold ; nor that Germany, although Protestant, retained for a longer time, and with far greater tenacity, its positive religious beliefs ;—nay, he is constrained to do special homage to the English and Scottish philosophy, as having been, even in its worst specimens, less infected with the spirit of heterodox rationalism than any of the continental Schools. He tells us that down to the days of Kant, the German philosophy, although cultivated by Protestants, was in a great measure Catholic ; and that the Lutheran Leibnitz was Catholic in his speculations, while the Catholic Descartes was Protestant in his meditations ; that Descartes took the fatal germ of his doctrine from the reform that sprung up in Germany, and this fatal germ was planted in philosophy by a Frenchman and a French Catholic ; that it has grown and fructified much more in an orthodox country where it was a stranger, than in the country where it was produced—the country where analogous beliefs might have seemed to aid and further its development. He admits the fact, but attempts to explain it, by ascribing it partly to the difference of race and natural temperament, and partly to the difference in point of social condition, and especially of public institutions ; while he still adheres tenaciously to the idea that philosophy has been retrograde chiefly because it has divorced itself from the Infallible Church. He shows a just appreciation of the solid, sterling philosophy of England, and especially of the judicious and profound writings of Thomas Reid ; but he qualifies his eulogium in a way that is at once instructive and amusing.—

“ La philosophie Anglaise occupe une place moyenne entre la philosophie Française et la philosophie Allemande.”—“ Le génie Anglais est avide de positif et très habile à étudier et à pratiquer la science de la vie extérieure ; mais il n’oublie pas pour cela que la véritable valeur des choses matérielles dépend des concepts rationnels, et que le sens pratique ne peut exister sans la morale et la religion.”—“ Le sens commun milieu entre la connaissance idéale pure et l’appréhension sensible, est le caractère le plus général de la philosophie Anglaise, interposée entre la philosophie Allemande, où domine l’intention idéale, et la philosophie Française, où règne la perception sensible. Aussi l’ECOLE D’EDIMBOURG, dans laquelle la raison prend les formes du sens commun, renferme-t-elle la doctrine Anglaise par excellence ; elle est comme la moyenne dont les autres sectes qui tendent aux extrêmes se rapprochent ou s’éloignent plus ou moins. On ne trouve certainement en Angleterre ni un Leibnitz, ni un Vico, ni un Male-

branche, qui sont les rois de la sagesse moderne, et les seuls pairs des grands sages de l'antiquité. *La raison de cela est qu'ils sont catholiques, et que la philosophie Britannique sort des sources infectes de l'hérésie religieuse et de la doctrine Cartésienne. S'il eût été catholique, Berkeley aurait pu donner à son île un Malebranche, à qui il ne le cède ni en sagacité, ni en génie. En revanche, on ne trouve pas non plus en Angleterre un seul exemple illustre en fait de panthéisme et d'autres rêveries pareilles non plus que de certaines brutalités, certaines crudités du Sensisme Français. Locke était beaucoup plus religieux que tous les Encyclopédistes.*—"Si le Cartésianisme, père du sensisme et du panthéisme n'a pas produit en Angleterre les mêmes fruits qu'en France et en Allemagne, c'est aux *institutions religieuses qu'il faut l'attribuer!* Parmi toutes les sectes hétérodoxes, l'Anglicanisme est en effet une des moins éloignées du Catholicisme; par sa hiérarchie elle tient un milieu entre le Catholicisme et le Protestantisme. Aussi la Réforme Anglicaine, en conservant en partie le principe vivifiant de l'ordre hiérarchique préserva les dogmes traditionnels d'une ruine totale, et ces dogmes font que l'idée morale et religieuse est universellement considérée en Angleterre comme un héritage inviolable; héritage public et privé, héritage de la société et de la famille."—"THOMAS REID, le premier philosophe de l'Angleterre, sinon par son génie, au moins par la bonté de sa doctrine, fut moins subtil et moins profond que Kant, avec lequel il a beaucoup de ressemblance, mais aussi il fut bien plus judicieux; il évita les paradoxes les plus énormes des autres sectes sorties du principe commun en légitimant au profit de la philosophie les vérités traditionnelles, sous le nom d'instinct et de sens commun. Le sens commun n'est en substance que la vérité idéale transmise par la religion et la parole, et connaturelle à l'esprit humaine, tant par sa vertu intrinsèque que par l'effet de l'éducation et d'une longue habitude."—P. 146.

Now, how do these facts bear on the exclusive claims of Catholicism as the mother and mistress of true philosophy? A professed Catholic is the author of the Heterodox Rationalism, which Gioberti condemns; a Catholic nation nurses and develops it, till it issues in the extreme of sensualism and infidelity. A professed Protestant revives the Ideal Theory which Gioberti wishes to restore; and German and British Protestants retain and cherish their religious convictions; the mind of England and Scotland is thoroughly alienated from the Infallible Church, yet confessedly imbued with a sound, moderate, and healthful philosophy. Why? Because the Church in England retained something of Catholicism in still upholding the Hierarchy! Yet *Bishop Berkeley* would have been a second Malebranche, had he been only a Catholic! and *THOMAS REID*, the first philosopher of England, was unfortunately a *Presbyterian Pastor* in the least hierarchical country of Europe! Still the poison of Rationalism

was counteracted by our religious institutions. Most true ; but by institutions based on Protestant grounds, and powerful only because, under the blessing of the Spirit of God, they tended to leaven the public mind with the grand, eternal, immutable principles of Bible truth.

The peculiar theory of Gioberti may be described generally as an expansion and completion of Malebranche's Ideal Vision. It is his avowed aim to divorce philosophy from the Rationalism of Descartes and his followers, and to reunite it to the Church by the chain of Catholic tradition. In a letter on the philosophical and political doctrines of M. de Lamennais, he gives an account of the way in which he was led to the adoption of his present views. "Having given myself," he says, "with confidence, for more than ten years, to the principle of abstract being, which I believed to be certain ; and having followed it out by a rigorous logic to its legitimate results, I found myself unwittingly a Pantheist. After making many a vain effort to modify this involuntary Pantheism, the corollary from false but specious principles, and sanctioned by some respectable names, I came to know that I had been deceived, and felt that I must retrace my steps, and resume my synthèses and analyses. I saw that to avoid that error, it was necessary to add to the idea of Being some other notion which was at once primordial and yet subordinate to it. Now, we may attain this second notion, by taking being out of its *state of abstraction*, and considering it in the *concrete*, as the absolute, the creative, since *being* thus considered implies the idea of an effect, (possible or actual,) *i.e.*, of an *existence* which forms no part of its nature, but which, being the free product of will, is connected with it by creation. According to this view, there would be one only principle whence the human spirit sets out, *i.e.*, the idea of a Being pure and necessary, who created contingent existences, and this fundamental truth would produce a fundamental fact, *viz.*, the reality of *existence* itself, and would explain the substantial distinction between being and existence by the intermediate idea of creative action. He ascribes his first glimpse of this truth to the sacred tetragrammaton, "I AM THAT I AM," viewed in the light of the Catholic philosophy, as taught by Leibnitz, Vico, Malebranche, Gerdil, St. Thomas, St. Anselm, and St. Augustin. Premising that God, the supreme object of philosophy, although intelligible in Himself, is not in all respects intelligible to us, owing to the finitude of our minds, he lays down a fundamental distinction between the intelligible and the sur-intelligible ; and adds, that in so far as He is intelligible, He is apprehended by reason ; but in so far as

He is sur-intelligible, He is made known by revelation. In the former aspect, He is the immediate object of our mental intuition, and that, too, not only in the necessity of His being, but also in his character as Creator, for we intuitively apprehend God as absolute in Himself, and moreover, as producing the world out of Himself. Reflection merely repeats, or throws into the form of definite expression, the twofold judgment that is involved in this primary intuition, which may be expressed by saying either, "God is, and creates the world," or more generally, "*L'ETRE CREE LES EXISTENCES*," a proposition which he denominates "the Ideal Formula," and which he describes as a fundamental truth, having all the properties of a first principle. By being, (*l'Etre*,) he understands the absolute, necessary, Eternal Being, independent, having no bounds or limits, whether in respect of duration or perfection, which is the first substance and first cause. By *existence*, (*l'existence, or les existences*,) he understands contingent beings,—an idea which he conceives to be implied in the etymology of the term, (*ex-sistere*,) which involves at once the notion of *reality* and of *derivation*. By creation, he means that action which brings into existence what did not exist before, by virtue of a power which belongs necessarily to the First Cause; for, while he carefully guards against the error of Cousin, who represents creation as a necessary effect, and describes it as the product of a free and sovereign will, he holds that an infinite and perfect being is necessarily creative in the sense of having necessarily the power to produce such an effect. The judgment which is thus expressed in the Ideal Formula is held to be intuitive and self-evident; it is founded on evidence, but on evidence which is prior to reflection—on evidence which is not subjective, but objective; it flows in upon the mind from the *Object*, like a ray falling on the eye from the sun: it exercises an imperious sway over the mind in the very act of enlightening it; it is the voice of God, (*l'Etre*,) who, placing Himself before the soul of man, and revealing Himself as intelligible, says, "*I am*;" or, as the French editors express it, "*L'evidence est objective—elle est donc la voix de l'Etre, qui se posant en face de notre âme, lui dit, Je suis nécessairement.*" To this idea the author attaches great importance, for otherwise, the first judgment, which is the basis of all certitude, would be purely subjective, and then scepticism would be inevitable. But God reveals Himself to our mind by virtue of His intelligibility; the mind contemplates Him by simple intuition or immediate *aperception*; the mind is merely the hearer and witness of that judgment, objective and divine; and when reflection follows, we throw the judgment into the form of a proposition, which the mind recognises as legitimate and valid,

because it sees in it only the simple repetition of the judgment pronounced by the Being (*l'Être*) himself.

The Ideal Formula, thus explained, embraces two cycles, or processes, the one bearing on the *fact*, the other on the *end* of creation. The first cycle proceeds from being to existence, through the intermediate act of creation; but, in creating existence, God cannot terminate in that as his last end. The creative act must therefore, so to speak, return to the source whence it set out, by leading up existence to being. Hence the second cycle, which is the necessary complement of the first: in the former, God is the sole agent; in the latter, created beings concur as second causes, under the direction and influence of the first cause: existence returns to God, not to be identified with Him as Pantheists dream, but to be united with Him by love and knowledge, without losing its proper substance and personality.

This formula is offered as a basis for universal science, and a reason for all truths, of whatever kind—the whole encyclopædia of human knowledge being but the development of the fundamental principle thus announced. The ideal formula exhibits what he calls the *premier philosophique*, which is the sole principle and base both of the intelligible and real; and this again includes both the *premier psychologique*, *i.e.*, the first idea, and the *premier ontologique*, *i.e.*, the first being: and in proof of the scientific universality of his formula, he proceeds, after referring to the genealogical trees of human knowledge that were formerly sketched by Bacon and D'Alembert, to furnish one of his own; dividing all science into three branches, *viz.*, Philosophy, (*i.e.*, Ontology or the knowledge of the Intelligible,) Physics, (including Psychology as well as Natural Science,) and Mathematics; and attempting to show that these three correspond respectively with the three terms of his formula, and that all the particular sciences comprehended under these generic titles admit of being referred to it in one or other of the two cycles which belong to it. Thus to the subject (*l'Être*) belong Philosophy, properly so called, which takes cognizance of the intelligible, and Revealed Theology, which makes known the sur-intelligible. To the predicate (*l'existence*) belong the Physical Sciences, including the mental, as well as material objects; while to the copula (*créé*) belong Arithmetic, which has its origin in the concept of time, Geometry, which is founded on the concept of space, Logic, which has reference to the true, and Ethics, which treats of the good. A similar formula is furnished as applicable to Revealed Theology, or the science of the sur-intelligible;—“*L'ÊTRE RACHÈTE L'EXISTANT*,” the fall being presupposed, and redemption in the revealed taking the place of creation in the

rational formula; or otherwise "Dieu crée l'Eglise." We think it unnecessary, and it might be tedious, to enter into any farther exposition of this singular theory: but we may be permitted, before bringing our Article to a close, to offer a few remarks upon it, having a special reference to those points at which it may seem to come into contact and collision with the views generally prevalent in our own land.

And, 1. We think it must be evident to all who are competent to form an opinion on the subject, that the proposal of such a formula for the adoption of any class of men who are disposed to doubt or dispute the being of God or the existence of the soul and the world, will be regarded and treated by them as an enormous *petitio principii*; and if an appeal be made to their own consciousness in favour of the self-evidence of the proposition, we doubt whether, apart from proofs of a different kind, one would be found among ten thousand to respond to it, in the only sense in which it could be of any practical avail for the purposes either of a sound philosophy or of a sound faith.

2. We think it equally clear that the proposal of such a formula at the present time affords sufficient evidence that, as yet, the spirit of the Baconian philosophy has made little progress abroad, and is far from being adequately appreciated by our Continental neighbours. The synthetic and deductive method is still obstinately adhered to in matters to which it cannot properly be applied, and used as a means of proving what can only be proved by the evidence of experience and observation. Thus Gioberti may be perfectly right in saying that both the "*principe téléologique*" and the "*principe de causalité*" are furnished by reason and not by experience, while it is nevertheless true that the *facts* to which these principles are applied are known only by observation *a posteriori*. And yet, insisting on a rigorous deduction of all human knowledge from some one radical and fundamental principle, he goes so far as to say that a Catholic proves the *existence of man* from the existence of God; that the proof of the real existence of other things depends for its validity on the intuitive apprehension of God as creator; that we do not infer the being of God from the existence of order, but the existence of order from the idea of God; and that the common term Judge, which is applied both to God and man, is not transferred analogically from the latter to the former, but *vice versa*.

3. We might remark on the very equivocal use of the words *parole* and *foi*, which severally represent the method of Divine manifestation, and the method of human reception, in so far as the Truth is concerned, whether it belong to the intelligible or the sur-intelligible. But not to insist on this, although it affects

materially the value of many parts of his theory, we proceed to observe—

4. That his views in regard to the relations subsisting between Psychology and Ontology appear to us to be defective, and his fears as to the pernicious influence of the former, whether on the truths of Philosophy or Faith, grossly exaggerated. It is true that he indicates more than once a distinction between Psychology and Psychologism; the former denoting the inductive or experimental philosophy of mind, the latter a speculative system which commences, like that of Descartes, with initial doubt, and professes to found on mere sensibles, external and internal, but apart from the intuitions of reason, a philosophy of God, of man, and of the universe. We have somewhere seen the term Psychologiste applied to designate a student of the one, and Psychologue to designate a partizan of the other. And it is due to Gioberti to give him the full benefit of this distinction, since he admits more than once the value of Psychology, as a useful preparative or propædæutic, and specially commends to his countrymen the careful study of the writings of the Scottish and Italian Schools. And farther, when he defines the term Psychologisme, we see that he means something very different from the Inductive science of mind. “L'hétérodoxie dont nous parlons peut se définir *la substitution du sensible à l'intelligible, comme point de départ de la philosophie.*” Or, in other words, “la substitution du sensible interne à l'intelligible, comme premier principe, et de la réflexion psychologique à la raison, comme instrument principal ou au moins initial de la philosophie.” “*Ce système, qui part du sens intime pour en tirer et en fabriquer tout l'édifice de la Connaissance humaine, peut être justement nommé Psychologisme.*” It corresponds, in short, with Sensualism, taken in a large sense as including the facts of consciousness as well as those of sensation. He seems to think that the radical vice of modern speculation consists in this—that the right order between Psychology and Ontology has been reversed, that an attempt has been made to found the truths included in the latter on the data furnished by the former; and that the only method of restoring a sound philosophy is to revert to the methods of former and better times, or in his own words, “the abolition of Psychologism, and the re-establishment of a strong and profound Ontologism, is the only plank that can save European Philosophy from a total shipwreck.” Now we submit, in the first place, that Psychology, considered simply as the Inductive science of mind, does not necessarily exclude a sound system of Ontology, but serves on the contrary to furnish certain data which are indispensable for the construction of such a system: secondly, that the germ of a sound Ontology exists,

although perhaps it has not been fully developed, in the best systems of modern Psychology, as is in fact admitted by himself with reference to the works of Reid, Stewart, and Rosmini: and thirdly, that Psychology does not supersede, nor in any way interfere with the peculiar province and functions of Intuition, whatever these may be—but taking cognizance of the whole contents of the human consciousness, notes and registers every concept, and every belief of whatever kind, without foreclosing any question that may be raised as to their origin, and leaving it perfectly open to every inquirer to account for them as he best may, either on the principles of the Sensationalist or on those of the Idealist. There might be a risk, no doubt, of scepticism, were the whole of human knowledge resolved into the materials furnished by sensation and reflection, unless it were clearly shown at the same time that the latter includes those intuitive perceptions, those first principles of reason, those fundamental laws of belief, to which the Scottish School have given so much prominence in their invaluable writings. But there need be no fear of scepticism, nor even of subjective idealism, if our Psychology be large enough to comprehend, and wise enough not to tamper with the province of Intuition.

5. In regard to the most solemn topic to which his theory applies—the Being of God—his doctrine of Intuitive Vision, or immediate aperception, appears to us to be liable to many serious difficulties which do not attach to the method of establishing this fundamental truth which has been generally followed in our own country. He holds that the Being of God is not argumentatively proved, but intuitively perceived; that any arguments which may be adduced in confirmation of our primary belief in it, are conclusive only by reason of their being mere *reconnaisances*, or faithful reflections of our prior Intuitions;—that we do not infer the Being of God from the existence of order in the physical and moral worlds; but, inversely, we derive our concept of order from the primary perception of God;—that the finite cannot represent the infinite, nor the contingent the necessary, nor the created the uncreated;—that God reveals himself directly, and is intuitively perceived by the soul of man. “The idea of God must be an immediate perception of the object itself, *i.e.*, of God, discerned by our Intuition in his substantial reality.” Now, we have no doubt that the proof to which we usually appeal on this fundamental article of our faith rests ultimately on a perception which has all the characteristics of Intuition. But the question is, whether it be mediate or immediate? whether it be the direct Intuition of the object, or the perception of that object by means of certain SIGNS? This is the hinge on which the whole controversy turns:

Gioberti holds that Signs are indispensable in the processes of reflection, but not in the act of Intuition; that Intuition seizes its object immediately, "*sans l'intermédiaire d'aucun signe.*" And yet we think his own admissions on some kindred questions might have suggested to his mind a different view. He says that the Ideal world is to the soul what the Material world is to the senses: that in both cases there is an immediate perception of the object; that the question as to the Being of God is very similar to that respecting the existence of an external world;—nay, "that the perception which we have of God corresponds exactly to the perception admitted by the Scottish School with regard to body." Now, the Scottish theory of perception, while it excludes *ideas* as representing body, is not exclusive of *signs*: on the contrary, Gioberti himself marks it as one of the excellencies of the Scottish theory, that it recognises other signs besides words. "*Les paroles sont les principaux signes, mais non les seuls: tous les sentiments sont de véritables signes des choses, selon la belle et profonde doctrine de Thomas Reid.*" Now if Reid's refutation of the Ideal theory with reference to body be applicable, as Gioberti says it is, to all the objects of our intuitive knowledge; and if the intermediate use of signs be admitted in the case of sensible perception, without destroying its intuitive character and certainty, why may not *signs* be admitted also as media through which God reveals Himself to His intelligent creatures? Why may not the adaptations of nature, the manifold indications of design, and the order and harmony of the universe, be the signs or media through which our intelligence discerns His Being, His personality, and His perfections?

But whatever may be the defects of his Philosophical theory, it gives us pleasure to add that, retaining, as he does, many of the human inventions by which Popery has corrupted the simplicity of the faith, he exhibits, in a clear and impressive light, not a few of the *positive truths of Revelation*, which have been too often neglected or discarded by the nominal Protestantism of the Continent. Many a learned Lutheran may well stand rebuked when he reads such testimonies as the following to the eternal verities of God from the pen of a devoted Romanist. On the doctrine of the Fall he thus writes:—"Christianity fully explains the inclination to evil which prevails universally amongst men, by ascribing it to the first sin: and it attributes that sin, not to a perverse and prior instinct, but solely to the nature of free-will—which might incline either to good or evil."—"The only rational view which can be taken of human perfectibility leads us to consider man as *actually fallen*, and bound to return to his chief end, so as to rise to the high destiny which Provi-

dence has marked out for him.”—“The psychological study of the human heart confirms the sad truth of a *fact*, whose origin can only be explained by the light of heaven. The dogma of the first fall is the sur-intelligible revealed, which illustrates the present and universal fact of the inability of man to fulfil his destiny, and which renders a reason for a phenomenon at variance with the general harmony of the universe.” On the doctrine of Original Sin, or the influence and effect of the Fall on all the generations of our race, he adds: “It may be shewn in the most rigorous manner, that without the dogma of Original Sin, Manichæism is inevitable.”—“The first transgression has infected the whole of human nature, and appears reflected in every part of it.” And so on the doctrine of Predestination: “It cannot be denied that there is a predestination for nations, as well as for individuals; and that in both cases the Divine ordination has a double aspect, according as we consider the gifts of grace or the bounties of nature. From the sum and combination of these diverse predestinations spring the moral harmony of the world, and the history of Providence. To deny Predestination, natural or supernatural, is to exclude Divine interposition in the affairs of men; to exaggerate it, by suppressing or limiting free-will, is in effect to destroy it.”—“Gratuitous Predestination establishes the absolute dominion of God over the universe, and even over free spirits, which must be in subjection to the first cause.”—“Predestination is the demonstrable consequence of the absolute right pertaining to God, who, without predestination, would cease to be the first cause.”—“God is the supreme and free Ruler, who, having the power to make a difference between men in temporal respects, has equally the power to make a distinction and difference between them in things spiritual and eternal.” And so on the kindred doctrine of Election: “Man cannot be born again otherwise than by spiritual generation, and the election of grace. To speak properly, Grace is nothing but Election.” On the doctrine of the New Creation Christianity is described as the perfect restoration of the primitive state of humanity, and the direction of humanity towards its final state: and it is affirmed that this restoration can only be effected by an act of creation; for a body infected with mortal disease can find in itself neither antidote nor cure. Wherefore the renovation of man is a supernatural effect; and as such it is described in Scripture, where it is called a second creation, by which the Almighty renews the works of the first creation. The supernatural order of things, being a new course of existence, a new spiritual Cosmos, appears to us as the effect of a second creative act.” On the influence of the Holy Spirit, and especially its effect in enlightening the mind to discern the evidence

of Divine truth, his remarks bear a striking resemblance to those of Dr. Owen on "the reason of Faith." "The light of grace may well suggest, illustrate, and fortify the reasons of faith, but it cannot constitute them; otherwise it were impossible to discriminate between faith and fanaticism or superstition, and Christian assent would no longer be rational. If the reasons which prove the doctrines of the faith were not credible in themselves, then we must say that they are not true reasons; and Divine grace could never give them force. That heavenly gift is not designed to give to the truths of faith an objective validity which they do not intrinsically possess, but to dispose the mind to receive them, to taste them, to feel their preciousness and their efficacy, by dissipating the darkness of the understanding, by subduing the rebellious affections which prevent that tranquil consideration, and that loving adhesion to the truth in which the perfection of faith consists." On the doctrine of miraculous interposition—a doctrine, alas! rejected, and even ridiculed by many bearing the name of Protestants—his views are clear and strong. "The order of nature, although uniform and stable, is not immutable; being subordinate to the Creative power, it may be changed in the measure, time, and way that may seem best to the overruling wisdom. A miracle, which is contrary to the inferior laws of material nature, is in conformity with the moral and supreme law of the universe. That supreme law is the subordination of matter to mind, of the sensible to the intellectual order of the world. God, therefore, far from disturbing universal harmony, maintains it, by interrupting the course of physical forces in certain determinate cases, and for a most wise end." "A miracle is not incredible on the supposition of a God." His thoughts on life and death, and especially on the new revelation that may be expected on the instant of our transition from time into eternity, are profound and noble: "Religion imparts an infinite value to the temporal life of man, by connecting it strictly with life eternal; and death, which is the passage from the one to the other, receives from religious beliefs a new aspect and character. The faith beautifies death, and makes it sweet, agreeable, precious, desirable, by separating it from the idea of annihilation, which makes it dreadful to most men, and representing it to us as our deliverance from that earthly prison-house in which we agonize rather than live, and as a second birth into a true life. But death acquires a peculiar value to the man devoted to the study of truth, and accustomed to fix his eyes on the impenetrable veil which conceals a great part of it from his view, for it appears to him as the *transformation of the sur-intelligible into the intelligible, and the complete Revelation of God.*"

And on the doctrine of the future, eternal punishment of the wicked, his "trumpet gives no uncertain sound." "The eternity of rewards or of punishments will be in a great measure the effect of virtuous or vicious habitude, now become natural to souls good or wicked, and inseparable from their condition."—"The eternity of punishment is a doctrine frightful to the weak understanding and corrupted affections of men;" but "it is an article of the criminal code established by God and promulgated by revelation. Man has no right to judge the justice of the law and the equity of the penalty; the Divine jurisprudence has no resemblance to that of the ten (or twelve) tables which were publicly exposed, that the citizens might make known their advice before their promulgation. Human logic has neither the necessary principles nor the force of judgment requisite to weigh and estimate the code of God. Instead of rejecting the eternity of punishment, because it appears too severe or unjust, reason ought, on the contrary, to regard it as perfectly just and right, because it has been revealed by Him who cannot lie. Human reasoning cannot avail against a Divine fact; but the Divine fact ought to convince the reason of man."

We have referred to these testimonies, to what we conceive to be the unchangeable and eternal truths of God, partly with the view of doing justice to the character of a bold and manly opponent, whose sentiments on other topics we have ventured to controvert, but chiefly in the hope that his Protestant antagonists may be impressed with the conviction, that the presence of such positive doctrines may impart, even to a system of error, a strength and stability which cannot belong, in the nature of things, to any set of mere abstractions or negations, such as has too often been exhibited in the cold, dead, lifeless Rationalism which so grievously misrepresents Protestant Christianity on the continent of Europe.

ART. IV.—1. STEIN.—*Sozialismus in Frankreich.*

2. FRÖBEL.—*System der Sozialen Politik.*

3. GRÜN.—*Die Soziale Bewegung in Frankreich und Belgien.*

4. BRUNO BAUER.—*Die Bürgerliche Revolution in Deutschland seit dem Anfang der deutsch-catholischen Bewegung bis zur Gegenwart.*

THE literature of Socialism* indicates at best but imperfectly the strength and practical tendencies of the movement which it undertakes to represent and to direct. No sect which ever attempted to convert the world has been so variously distracted by internal differences, while yet in a militant state, without any footing in actual and real life. Most of the prophets of social regeneration denounce all the rest as fanatics and impostors. The French phalanstère looks down on the English parallelogram; the rights of freedom are vindicated by the bold anarchism of Proudhon against the social despotism of St. Simon and of the Icarian Communists; and the lively disciple of Feuerbach, the Humanist Grün, complacently ridicules as illogical charlatans all who would strive, in a perfected world, to retain the names or the shadows of religion, morality, and law.

But in the mean time the vigour of the crusade against property is little affected by the dissensions of its leaders. It is easier to act in concert than to think in unison; and all the schools of Socialism have one immediate purpose in common—the overthrow of the existing form of society. The means to be used are as intelligible as the object to be attained—universal suffrage, as an experiment; and if it fails—barricades and bayonets. Thus far the Socialist leaders are agreed with their followers and with each other; and the mass of their supporters look no farther. The Parisian artisan may speculate on a guarantee of labour, and a minimum of wages, while the landless peasant hopes for a new division of the soil: in all cases the poor man can hardly fail to believe that he would profit by a more equal distribution of wealth. What he asks from his teachers is not so much a theory for the reconstruction of society, as an assurance that such theories will be forthcoming when they are required: and he farther requires some plausible arguments to satisfy him that his cause is just and honest, as well as conducive to his own interest. The polemical discussions of theorists supply these wants, and keep public interest alive, without

* In the absence of any term which includes both the positive organization of Socialism and the negative doctrines of Communism, we have applied the term Socialist, as the more general and more familiar, to all the different schools of social regeneration.

dividing the multitude into parties, or weakening their common enthusiasm. The differences on which the controversies turn all affect the future ; and all assume the possibility of a future which, however indefinite, will at least be in its social organization unlike the present and the past. Whenever an attempt to equalize or to annihilate property shall succeed in any part of the world, the theoretical difficulties of Socialism will begin to divide the mass of its adherents into opposing or hostile factions. For statesmen, the numbers and strength of the opponents of property form a more serious matter of consideration than the special banners and watchwords which they may have been induced to adopt. The statistics of Socialism deserve little reliance, in consequence of the party-feeling of those who have professed to examine them ; but there can be little doubt that, in the departments of France which have returned the minority of the present Assembly, in Switzerland, Suabia, the Palatinate, Silesia, and Poland, and, to a smaller extent, in many other parts of the Continent, the ancient belief in the sacredness of property has given way to hopes of a new system of rights, under which the problem of social and economic equality may be wholly or approximately solved. It is not by elaborate reasoning that the old faith has been shaken, and it will not be, at present at least, re-established by argument. The adherents of property must be content to rely for their security on the numerical majority which they probably retain, and on the superior strength which they certainly possess. The final decision of the questions at issue belongs perhaps to a remote future ; but the permanent resistance and ultimate victory of property will depend on the existence of a conviction in the minds of its advocates sufficiently solid and well-reasoned to resist the passionate enthusiasm of the social revolutionists.

It is, for this reason, far more important to the opponents of Socialism, than to the Socialists themselves, to understand the different systems which have been proposed for the reconstruction of the world. As long as the destructive process is the only practical business of the time, the assailants will be abundantly supplied with reasoning sufficiently plausible to satisfy and to unite them. The evil which exists can always be attributed to the institutions which it accompanies ; and the undeniable interest of proprietors can be represented as the only ground on which they defend the rights of property. Experience, which teaches that the actual world is by no means perfect, can never show the imperfections which might exist in Utopia. It is proverbially impossible to prove a negative.

Fortunately, the leaders and representatives of Socialism have been led by inclination, or compelled by their position, to under-

take a responsibility from which their followers were exempt. There has been no want of imaginary republics and future Edens, or of comprehensive dogmas, in which the germ of the institutions of the future is involved. By a natural and happy propensity, the Socialist writers have also, as we have already observed, supplied the negative as well as the positive elements of the controversy—criticising each other with a zest and an interest which none of them have excited in an equal degree among those who are fundamentally opposed to them all. Proudhon and Considérant are more formidable enemies to each other than either of them has found in Thiers or Guizot; and the slaughter of Utopian philosophers by Grün resembles that which Strauss effected among the rationalist interpreters of Scripture—*Ottomanorum more regnare non possunt nisi cum fratres omnes contrucidaverint.*

It is by a similar investigation of the reconstructive systems which are proposed by the enemies of existing society, that the true meaning of their demands must be understood, and the answer to them discovered, if at all. We are far from thinking that it has been found as yet. To all who have rejected Socialism without inquiry, and to many who have unconsciously admitted its principles, the chimerical visions of Fourier, and the anarchism of the modern Humanists, furnish matter only for laughter. The innumerable caricatures of Considérant with his tail, and of Proudhon with his anti-proprietary pickaxe, addressed to the half-socialist middle classes of Paris, by artists who are possibly Socialists themselves, represent perhaps fairly enough the mixture of practical common sense and of loose reasoning which in all countries constitutes ostensible public opinion. The uneducated multitude, less shocked by strange results, reasons perhaps less inconsistently. If a phalansterian Utopia is necessary for the organization of labour, the many have faith strong enough for the Phalanstère itself; nor will they shrink from the logician who proves to them that law and property and marriage must be abolished before equality can be realized upon earth. To the critic who wishes to understand Socialism, and to the conservative moralist who would oppose it, a similar conviction of the consistency of socialist deductions might not be without its value. The wildest speculators have an instinctive sense of unity and proportion; and even Fourier's dreams may perhaps not have been wholly delirious. Like Alnaschar,* he may have

* The comparison between Alnaschar and Fourier is not wholly arbitrary. The barber of Bagdad's brother calculated that, by successive re-investments of the capital represented by a basket of eggs, he would become rich enough to marry the Vizier's daughter. Fourier undertook to pay the English national debt, an amount many times greater than all the dowries of all Viziers' daughters from

imagined no events but such as were necessary for his imaginary paradise; nor will his life have been entirely useless, if he should eventually have taught the world that the societarian harmony which he preached depends on the economic conditions which he prophesied. M. Louis Blanc would lament to learn that labour can never be efficiently organized until we live, ourselves with the stature of giants, in continents more fertile than the gardens of the Hesperides, studded with Fourierist palaces, lit up and warmed by new Fourierist moons, inhabited by animals yet uncreated for our use, and washed by an ocean of lemonade.

In other words, the question between individualism and socialism is conveniently simplified by the admission of the Phalansterian prophet, that the regeneration of the world must, if it is to succeed, be preceded or accompanied by an increase of material wealth, not only vast in itself, but so sudden as to anticipate the advance of population. The question is thus removed into the sphere of political economy, a science which, according to the just definition of a Communist contributor to the *Deutsches Bürgerbuch*, is in its present form the philosophy of self-interest; and it will remain to inquire, first, Whether the proposed multiplication of wealth is practicable? and, secondly, Whether, in the production of it, the motives of individual interest can be dispensed with? For we are indebted to the clear-headed Proudhon and to the thoroughgoing Grün for a farther simplification of the problem, in the unanswerable proofs which they supply, that the fractional rights reserved to property in the Fourierist world are a mere inconsistency and illusion, a compromise with prejudice, as useless as the *fainéant* deity of the Cabetists, and likely to be much more troublesome. It is Proudhon, also, whom we have to thank for the just and pregnant antithesis that if property is fatal to equality Communism is the destruction of liberty. Logical honesty like his is a quality most welcome even to those who may oppose or criticise his views; and the want of it is sometimes partially supplied by the sense

Grenada to Bassora, with eggs alone, in six months. His calculation is as follows:—Assuming a dozen good fresh eggs to be worth half a franc, or fourpence-halfpenny, we require fifty thousand million dozen to pay off the English national debt. Now, in each of 600,000 phalanstères, it will be easy to keep 12,000 hens, which will lay every day in the year, instead of about 200 times, as at present; but, assuming only 200 eggs as the yearly produce of each hen, we have in a phalanstère daily, 1000 dozen of eggs, at one-half franc per dozen, 500 francs. yearly, 100,000 and in 600,000 phalanstères, 60,000,000,000 or, taking the number of hens at 10,000, 50,000,000,000 or £2,000,000,000 yearly, and therefore £1,000,000,000 in six months, as the value of eggs alone.

Yet this crazy charlatan supposed himself, and is said by his disciples to have been, a profound calculator and logician. He never asked who was to buy the eggs.

of harmony which influences the castle-building even of such moonstruck philosophers as Fourier, through all the rubbish of their mimic deductions and sham mathematical apparatus.

Of the works now before us, that of Fröbel is the only independent and complete scheme of society and politics. Stein is no Communist or Socialist, being, in fact, distinguished by a remarkable faith in monarchy, founded on arguments such as occur only to German scholars. Having undertaken the history of the French Social schools, he has accomplished his task with an elaborate tediousness worthy of his learning and of his nation. The true German book-writer will never pass over a point, and never approach a problem, but by regular parallels and orthodox zigzags, as prescribed by the laws of dialectic war. It is in vain that his readers wish to point out the openness of the breach, and the absence of resistance or of difficulties. He is too cautious to spare them a definition or a distinction, or to let them know that an egg is an egg, till he has ascertained that they thoroughly understand the *Begriff* or abstract notion of an egg. It would, however, be ungrateful to deny the industry and care with which Stein has studied the literature of Socialism, or the fulness of the account which he has given of the various sects which have been produced by French ingenuity and French credulity. His own general answer to the arguments of the writers whom he criticises is irreverently, but not unjustly, summed up by the scoffer Grün. "Louis Blanc begged me for God's sake to tell him what a German scholar, who had a four hours' talk with him, two years ago, had made out of the conversation. Probably Mr. Stein, I said. 'Yes; exactly so. Has he written a book? (The French are totally ignorant of our literature, which certainly is often a blessing.) What does he say?' As we were close to the Palais Royal I could not give a proper answer, and I merely said, 'Not much. He says the state is the state, and the *prolétaire* cannot overthrow the state, because the state is sacred—and is the state ———."

Stein, in a subsequent edition, avails himself of the opportunity of criticising Grün in turn; but he candidly admits the value of the information which his work contains. We are inclined to think that it is the most able and most instructive, as it is beyond comparison the most readable work in the historical literature of Socialism. The boast of Feuerbach that he was the first to introduce humour into philosophy derives some countenance from the amusing vivacity and ready irony of his Socialist disciple. The value of his criticism is greatly increased by the circumstance that, in revolutionary boldness, his opinions go beyond those of all the sects whom he reviews. The advocates of property are apt to censure innovators, in proportion to the extent of the

changes which they advocate. The Humanist, or Social Jacobin, on the contrary, ridicules them for shortcomings and for timidity, and points out the inconsistency with which they shrink from the consequences of their own principles, and the untenableness of their half-way position. Grün is no Stoic to be scandalized with the cakes and ale of the sensual paradise which Fourier and Enfantin would have realized on earth, but he has as little respect for theories of compromise as he would entertain for Blackstone's Commentaries or for the Whole Duty of Man. Democratic revolution he advocates only as the first step in the course of improvement, although he confesses that he occasionally finds himself singing an old bloodthirsty Jacobinical *carmagnole*. American equality finds little favour in his eyes. "It disgusts me more," he says, "than the old world, because this shopkeeping egoism wears the flush of an ostentatious healthiness; because in America they have not yet come to the split which goes through the heart of the old world, since every thing there is so much on the surface, so devoid of root, I would almost say so provincial. (*kleinstädtisch*.)" His criticism of Robespierre's Declaration of the Rights of Man, as far as it concerns property, is a fair specimen of his manner:—" 'The right of property must not interfere with the safety or freedom or existence of others.' (Art. 8.) The right of property must not interfere with property! Yes, Robespierre presses into one article the whole contradiction of *political* Socialism. 'Every act against the freedom, security, or property of a man, by whomsoever exercised, even in the name of the law, beyond the cases for which it has provided, and the forms which it prescribes, is arbitrary and void. Respect for the law itself forbids submission to it, and if it is attempted to be executed by force it may be resisted by force.' (Art. 25.) That is, property is legal. Property may be legally violated. Yet property cannot be legally violated. Resistance to legal violation of property, if such violation is illegal, is legal. An honest man you may have been, Maximilian Robespierre—a genius you were not."

It is to be feared that Fröbel's System of Social Politics would have found little favour with the Humanist critic, if it had come within the range of his discussion. Since the publication of the work in 1847 the author's name has become generally known in consequence of his mission to convey to the Vienna insurgents of October last the sympathies of the Left of the Frankfort Assembly. We are not aware of the reasons which induced Prince Windischgrätz to release Fröbel when he shot his colleague Blum, but from the book before us we should suppose him to be a well-meaning bookish theorist, and by no means a formidable agitator. In a first edition he had assumed the name of Caius Junius; but his careful and elaborate method, and his abstract

conclusions, are as little akin to the acrimonious pungency of Sir Philip Francis as to the revolutionary violence symbolized by the name of the conventional hero of regicides. Some of the remarks which have been made on the national pedantry of Stein will apply equally to Fröbel. He begins at the beginning, and will take nothing for granted. He has a system of anthropology, a system of psychology, he adds a long essay on ethnology, including an account of all existing nations and tribes; and, finally, he arrives at his system of Social politics as the child in the story book got his bread and butter after the blacksmith had forged the ploughshare, and the farmer had sown the corn, and the miller had ground the grain, and the baker had baked the bread. A deep foundation is no doubt desirable; but in some cases the question occurs, whether in so various a substructure there may not be some flaw, endangering the whole edifice? Practical men prefer building on the natural rock, which has been shown by experience, and admitted by general consent, to be solid and secure.

It is true, that in the most elaborate synthetic politics, where, from some innocent-looking axioms about free-will or human nature, an ingenious writer deduces a system of democracy or socialism, or perhaps of limited monarchy, it is easy to see that the conclusions were formed before the premises were invented to support them; and that if one set of metaphysical doctrines had obstinately refused their sanction to the scheme, another would have been summoned to supply their place. Fröbel required a system of absolute democracy which should admit of individual freedom, and allow the possession for life of private property, to relapse at death to the community. It would perhaps have been as useful to assert at once that such a form of society was desirable, as to occupy a volume in an examination of the nature of man, and of society in general, before coming to the foreseen conclusion. Those who approve of the scheme will find a philosophy to justify it without wading through Fröbel's laborious proofs that the individual precedes society, that society is necessary to the individual, that morality consists in the subordination of means to ends, and that the social compact of Rousseau is immoral. It would have been more satisfactory to show that the unrestricted government of a majority is compatible with the freedom of a minority, and that the arguments which are used to support the limitation of the right of property might not be extended to prove the necessity of its abolition. To the rights of minorities we must admit that Fröbel, who seems to be a very honest and candid inquirer, pays considerable attention; but he is hampered by his entire repudiation of authority, and of the social compact. He says, and in the ab-

stract with perfect justice, that the will or opinion of another cannot have any moral weight with the individual until he has adopted it as his own. It can only be recognised as an external force, to be resisted, if necessary, by force. In other words, the only absolute freedom is that which is exempt from all law and government,—a proposition which is as useless as it is true. But Fröbel is a democrat as well as a philosopher; and although he has repudiated the supposed right of the individual to alienate his absolute freedom by contract, he requires a justification for his faith in the right of majorities. To one of the conditions which he lays down we have no objection,—entire freedom of opinion, and of theoretical attempts at proselytizing. But this is evidently a mere reservation of a part of the freedom which he is about to sacrifice to his democratic system; as, indeed, he must have renounced it before he could have established any political system whatever. The second condition by which he would secure individual freedom is, that all persons shall be at liberty to emigrate, if they are dissatisfied with the Government at home. In other words, I will provide you with a polity in which you can always follow your own views, and I will secure your enjoyment of it by authorizing you to go elsewhere if your views are interfered with. The same guarantee for liberty is already offered by most European Governments. Even Russia provides Siberia as an alternative for the discontented. We had thought that the problem was to establish a perfect polity in Utopia, and not to send us out of Utopia to look for it.

As a socialist Fröbel is amiable and moderate, and, therefore, unavoidably inconsistent. He would wish to have all the advantages of equality, and to retain all the conveniences of property. He is perfectly aware that, with the present proportion of material wealth to numbers, an equal division would annihilate luxury and refinement without perceptibly improving the condition of the poor. It is therefore necessary to his scheme, as to all others of the same kind, that production should be increased; and how it is to be increased he does not show. The real difficulty of Socialism will always be found to resolve itself into economic pressure. Alter the laws of production, and it would become possible, when, perhaps, no one would care to realize it. In the same syncretic spirit Fröbel would retain the use of money, which is denounced by the stricter schools of Socialism; and he would even allow those who profess to follow intellectual pursuits to enjoy a maintenance without the necessity of resorting to manual or productive labour. Proudhon, once himself a working compositor, is less considerate to the literary craft, of which he is now no mean member. "I say, and I believe," he writes to Considérant, "that such and such a workman expends

more talent in shoeing a horse than such and such a *feuilletoniste* in writing a novel. * * * I am waiting with impatience for the ten volumes of the 'History of the Consulate and Empire,' announced by M. Thiers, to prove that the little corporal was not a giant."

On another point, in which Proudhon stands alone among socialists, Fröbel adopts the popular view first propounded by the disciples of St. Simon, of the necessity of the emancipation of woman; an object which, as he gravely remarks, is already realized in the greatest part of Africa. "Far from applauding," says the obstinate Proudhon, "what is at present called the emancipation of woman, I should rather incline, if it was necessary to come to this extremity, to place woman in seclusion." The formidable anarchist of Paris would be more inclined to agree with the solemn German on the question of religion. In accordance with the tendency which, notwithstanding some phrases of religious sentimentalism still used by Louis Blanc, and by the Fourierists, at present characterizes all the different sects of Socialism, Fröbel would reject all religion and all belief in a future state. Faith, he says, is principally used as a consolation to the unfortunate; and these are the very persons in whose case it is important to the progress of the world that their patience should be worn out. This is exactly the converse of Robespierre's argument, when he put on his celebrated blue coat and nosegay to proclaim his *Etre Suprême*. Such a belief, the Dictator said, is necessary for the consolation of the people, and for the terror of tyrants. One argument is worth exactly as much as the other. What can the political utility of an opinion have to do with the fact to which it refers? It is, however, not inconsistent in the sects which assert the perfectibility and potential omnipotence of mankind to ignore all motive power but the human will, and, in the interest of their paradise here, to reject what the Germans among them significantly call *das Jenseits*—the Beyond.

There are several points of resemblance between Fröbel's scheme and a work half a century old by a far greater writer, who has not generally been classed among socialists. Fichte's *Geschlossener Handelstaat*, or State self-contained for trading purposes, contains a large proportion of the theories which distinguish modern Socialism. Louis Blanc's Organization of Labour still more strongly resembles Fichte's imaginary system in its denunciation of free trade, and in the social despotism which is offered as the alternative for free individual competition. As we entirely acquit M. Blanc of any acquaintance with the obscurer parts of German literature, we cannot but think that the coincidence between the conclusions of the profound metaphysician

and the off-hand theories of the flashy journalist is in some degree curious and instructive. The French writer expanding popular notions, and generalizing on a few real or assumed facts, with an entire disregard to science, seems scarcely shallower than the great philosopher descending into the uncongenial sphere of political speculation. The reason seems to have been, that Fichte's inquiry was a mere dialectic exercise, an example to illustrate his philosophic doctrines, a Platonic Republic less successfully executed. He disregarded facts as easily as M. Blanc neglects the laws of political economy; in the assumption, for instance, that England and France must be united into one State before his ideal polity could be applied to either. The *Handelstaat* was a really synthetic system, in which the premises came before the conclusion. What is wanted is an analytic examination of the materials which are supplied by experience and history. Fröbel's, as we have already said, is the analysis of a preconceived result. The chief merit of his inquiry, beyond its apparent honesty and calmness of tone, consists in his estimation of the element of individual freedom as the first condition of a just form of society. Almost all the schools of social regeneration proclaim some one similar truth. Fourier himself was right when he taught the economical advantages of association, and the necessity of basing social harmony on the recognition, instead of the suppression, of natural feeling and passion. A complete knowledge of all modes of socialist thought would perhaps furnish the raw material for a perfect philosophy of politics. Sects err from one-sidedness; but it is something to see even one side of truth.

It forms no part of Stein's purpose to give a history of the Socialist tendencies of his own country. He might, perhaps, have devoted more attention to them if he had written three or four years later, when the German and Swiss movement had become more decided and conspicuous. His own views are of a kind probably not uncommon among the numerous Continental adherents of moderate liberalism. He lays great stress on the increasing predominance of social questions over mere political discussion, and shows historically how the triumph of democracy necessarily leads the victorious party to seek for some mode of using the power which it has acquired, beyond the mere boast of possessing it. Disapproving of universal suffrage as inconsistent with the maintenance of property, he yet recognises the want which democratic socialism seeks to satisfy, and complacently refers to the so-called statistics which are used to prove the impoverishing tendency of free trade and individual competition. He would have property used, but not abused; and he would provide for a distribution of wealth less unequal than that which

at present prevails, but without establishing equality as a principle or a right. In this well-meaning compromising spirit he praises the good tendencies and censures the excesses of the French sects of Socialism, from St. Simon to Proudhon. He thinks that the strange cosmogony of Fourier affords no justification to those who neglect his opinions on social economy; and he intimates his approbation of Louis Blanc's scheme of annihilating competition by ruining all individual producers at the expense of the tax-payer. As Fröbel would retain the advantages of property in his Socialist world, Stein would willingly import into existing society some fragments of philanthropic improvement from the distant Utopia. We cannot, however, see that, with all his methodical formality, he has sounded the depths of the question. The right of property is not an ultimate or inviolable principle. But all legislation and all society having hitherto been based on a recognition of its existence, it is scarcely probable that a fragmentary and occasional interference with it will be found consistent with the maintenance of the advantages which it is intended to secure. As long as individual self-interest is the moving power of society, it may admit of voluntary benevolence as an occasional check and corrective; but an attempt to hamper it, and yet to rely upon it, to take care that the machinery does not move too fast, without being prepared with any force which can supply its place, is an inconsistent and empirical subterfuge. The thoroughgoing Socialists are wiser. Most of them—Babœuf, St. Simon, and Cabet, as well as Louis Blanc, who can scarcely be called a systematic Socialist, would establish a social despotism, by which all should be compelled to do equally what men in the existing world are induced by interest to do in unequal proportions. They show a partial acquaintance with human nature, even when they forget the conditions of political economy.

Writers like these seldom notice either the approximate equality of distribution of the necessities of life which prevails under the present system of society, nor the probable effect of a farther distribution of the superfluities, or apparent superfluities, of the rich. In other words, they take issue with the advocates of Socialism on a moral or political ground, when the fundamental question is strictly economic. If A and B are swimming from a wreck, it may be difficult to argue, on grounds of abstract justice, that A has more right than B to a particular plank which floats near them. If the plank, however, will only hold one, it is better that A should have an exclusive property in it than that both should be drowned. The Socialist always argues on the assumption that the plank will bear the weight of both; and if an opponent admits the premise he may be led farther than he expects

or intends. The question, after all, is, whether the plank will serve for two as well as for one? It is, however, scarcely worth while to complain of a want of positive contributions to our knowledge, in a work which is professedly intended only as a criticism of the opinions of others.

Grün's purpose also is critical; but, belonging to the extreme school of Socialism, he necessarily lays down his own principles as the standard of comparison for those which he discusses. While Stein blames the different sects for their rejection of principles which they never professed to admit, the Humanist, inquiring how far they are consistent in carrying out their own doctrines, conveys a more distinct impression of the essential and positive characteristics which distinguish all forms of socialism from systems in which the full right of property is recognised. Though by no means above the use of common-places when they suit his purpose, though he is ready to infer from the co-existence of poverty and wealth that each is the cause of the other, although he can see in country life nothing but its pauperism, and in factories only strikes and stoppages, Grün never really relies on the popular and shallow arguments for Socialism, but assumes all its utmost results as proved and admitted. In pointing out the defects of the different systems, he rather stigmatizes as heresies than opposes as errors such fragmentary relics of exploded doctrines as the belief in the utility of money or in the possibility of religion. One weakness to which he finds the French peculiarly liable is a tendency to value their separate nationality, rather than to extend to the world at large the social unity which is to be realized among individuals. He scarcely attempts, however, to conceal his own German pride of intellectual superiority. He has himself, not content with leaving theology behind him, gone farther than Hegel could lead him, and passed under the guidance of Feuerbach even out of the domain of philosophy :

Beyond the night, across the day,
Through all the world he followed him.

He rejoices to repeat that the work of philosophy is done; that, after annihilating religion, it has dissolved itself in its own critical medium, and that actual, sensuous, concrete reality alone remains. But he knows that the French have not gone through the same experience, and he entreats them to leave Hegel alone, or else to learn to understand his meaning.

"Give up coffee and wine," he says, "for a year. Avoid exciting yourselves by any passionate feeling: let Guizot govern, and let Morocco subdue Algiers; sit in a garret and study Hegel's *Logic* and the *Phænomenology*. When the year is over, and you come into the streets with pale faces and bloodshot eyes, and tumble, for all I care,

over the first dandy or street-crier whom you meet, do not alarm yourselves; for you will have become great and mighty men, with a spirit like an oak tree, nourished by wondrous juices. All you see will reveal to you its hidden weakness; you will pass as spirits into the heart of Nature; your glance will be deadly; your word will remove mountains; your logic will be sharper than the sharpest guillotine. You stand before the Hôtel de Ville, and the bourgeoisie is no more; you advance to the Palais Bourbon, and it falls asunder, and all its Chamber of Deputies dissolves into thin air (*das Nihilum album*.) Guizot vanishes, Louis Philippe fades into a historical formula; and out of all these fallen 'momenta' rises, in the pride of victory, the 'Absolute Idea' of free society. Seriously, you can only master Hegel by first becoming Hegels. Moor's love can die only by the hand of Moor."*

In the same spirit he quotes an eloquent and brilliant passage from Heine's book, *De l'Allemagne*, which corresponds with the German *Salon* and the *Romantische Schule*, to the effect that Germany will yet outdo in boldness and horror all the revolutionary deeds of France. "The eagle will fall dead from the air at the crash, and the lions in the farthest deserts of Africa will hang their tails, and creep into their kingly dens. A drama will be performed in Germany, to which the French Revolution is a harmless idyl." It seems that Heine is a St. Simonian as well as a Republican. His compatriot justly appreciates his genius, and claims him for one of the foremost leaders of Socialism. Probably he was not aware that the patriotic poet, while he associated and sympathized with the conspirators and Socialist reformers of both France and Germany, retained for himself some of the advantages of the old régime. When Louis Philippe's secret pension list was published by M. Taschereau in April 1848, the name of Henry Heine appeared as the recipient of two hundred a year.

In Belgium, which was the first stage of his inspecting and proselytizing tour, Grün found but little to satisfy him. He smiled with complacent indifference at the controversies between the clerical or jesuitical party and the liberalism of the middle classes, and rather inclined to give the preference to the priests. "What is the use," he asks, "of telling the people that the man who gives them food and drink is a Tartuffe? It is indif-

* Heine, in one of the most humorous passages of his *Deutschland*, pretends that this process is actually taking place in France; explaining to "Father Rhine," who inquires after the *liebe kleine Franzosen*, whom he has not seen since Napoleon's time, that they have taken to philosophy, pipes, beer, and skittle-playing, like true Germans.

Sie studiren Kant, Fichte, und Hegel,
Sie rauchen Tabak, sie trinken Bier,
Und manche schieben auch Kegel.

ferent to the people, provided that Tartuffe does give them food and drink. What do you do for them, you liberal bourgeoisie?" Among socialists he found a few leaders; De Potter the well-known revolutionist, Bartels the editor of a paper called the *Débat Social*, and Jottrand, an early advocate of the organization of labour. But the *Débat Social* had only two hundred subscribers, and the public took no interest in the schemes of reformers who went beyond political questions. Belgium is too busy and industrious a country to have leisure for schemes of social regeneration. There, as in England, it is only among manufacturing operatives, and under the pressure of distress, that the abolition or reorganization of property is likely to be seriously discussed. It was among this class that Grün found the ablest socialist agitator in a demagogue named Jacob Kats, who appears to possess in a high degree the requisites of a popular leader. In company with Freiligrath, whom he states to have become a thorough Socialist, he attended Kats' *Flämische Meeting*, which seems to be a singular institution. On the Sunday morning Kats addressed an audience of working men and women on the subject of social change; in the evening, with some assistance, he performed a play of his own composition, in which his opponents seem to have been ridiculed with a good deal of rough humour, worthy of the original dramatic satires,

Quæ canerent agerentque peruncti facibus ora.

In the interval the German scholar and the Flemish weaver talked "of terrorism, the guillotine, Robespierre, and such Nürnberg playthings;" and Kats, though a devoted admirer of Robespierre, was pleased to accept from his new friend a demonstration that the fall of the Dictator was unavoidable, because neither he nor any of his contemporaries were prepared to introduce the social changes which alone could have completed the revolution. In return, Grün makes allowances for some shortcomings in the agitator's Socialist doctrines, and especially for a habit of using Christian phrasology to express his philanthropic conceptions. As Kats in his definition of religious liberty includes an express prohibition of any kind of priesthood, perhaps he may not really have fallen far short of the standard of socialist orthodoxy. The patronizing air with which the German missionary notices and applauds the plebeian agitator is not the least amusing part of his Belgian experiences. But it is time to follow him to the wider sphere of Parisian Socialism, in the hope that he may find it less dull and prosaic than its utilitarian neighbour, which seems to him on the whole utterly uninteresting. Money and religion, he says, are dominant there, though not protected as in France by the arm of power. "Belgium is little America."

The extinct school of the St. Simonians naturally calls for his first attention, as the earliest in point of time among the different sects which have made themselves conspicuous during the last twenty years. He approves of the philanthropic tendencies of St. Simon, of his profession of reconciling spirit with matter, and of his proposed abolition of the right of inheritance; but the enthusiast, who wished to found a new Christianity, is only pitied for the confusion of his views by the Humanist critic. All the truths of Socialism, he says, are to be found potentially in St. Simon, but none actually—"He is the most captivating of Socialists, and the unsoundest." Grün is perfectly right in objecting to the St. Simonist formula, that it substantially recognises social distinctions and unequal possessions, although it would alter the basis on which they at present rest. "To every one according to his capacity, and to every capacity according to its works," is but a new rule of aristocracy and property, differing only from the existing law of society by substituting despotism for the mixed reign of chance and of free competition which at present exists. Civilized life is a composite game of chance and skill, where the luckiest and the cleverest is the winner. St. Simon and his followers would have substituted for this rough machinery of freedom a tribunal which should absolutely award the stakes to the most skilful and persevering player. It has been evident to all critics of this celebrated formula, that it involved a submission to the despotic authority of the tribunal, which should measure capacities and performances. St. Simon, in the successive stages of his vanity and caprice, would have vested the government of his society in several different authorities, of which the first was, we believe, a council of men of science, who were to leave a vacant chair for their imaginary president, Sir Isaac Newton. In later times he invented his new religion to conceal the rudeness of his political scheme; and his disciple, *Enfantin*, the picturesque prophet of sensuality, enthroned in the vacant place the priestly pair, consisting of himself and the destined "coming woman." As Grün justly remarks, the system was copied from Catholicism, and whether the priest, who was to govern society, "wore a cassock and received the tonsure, or walked about in a frock-coat with hair on the crown of his head," is a matter very indifferent.

Pierre Leroux, who left the St. Simonian Church in virtuous indignation when Father *Enfantin* delivered himself of his revelations on marriage, approaches several degrees nearer to the standard of orthodox Socialism. His demand of absolute equality, his substitution of the wants of men for their capacities as the rule of distribution, for a moment seem to satisfy the severe German critic. But, on closer examination, he finds that even in Leroux

there remains a portion of the old leaven of religion and inequality which taints the whole mass of his theory. Leroux, conscious perhaps that some power is requisite to move society, would found his future equality like St. Simon, on a new religion consisting of general sentimentalities on the love of God and of man. Then, exclaims Grün, the door is opened to prophecy, priesthood, and sovereignty of the religious over the irreligious. Leroux says that Robespierre was wrong in *forcing* religion on the people. Grün declares that the mistake was in the religion and not in the force, and on his own principles he is perfectly right. A polity entirely founded on religion must be directed on religious grounds by religious persons. The irreligious would become an opposition party, and if the weaker, an oppressed *proletariat*. Leroux farther talks of aristocrats, consisting of the most learned and most loving, who are to live on equal terms with the general democracy. "Undoubtedly," says Grün, "Pierre Leroux is one of the most learned and most loving; but I will be no democrat where he is an aristocrat; and with my good will, no Pierre Leroux, no George Sand, no Hegel, and no Goethe shall establish himself as an aristocrat by the side of—that is over—the meanest besombinder."

To an acute and humorous observer Fourier offers more ludicrous peculiarities than all other Socialists together, including St. Simon and Père Enfantin. And yet Grün, although he rejects the scheme as impossible and obsolete, not only devotes a larger space to the discussion of the Phalansterian system than to that of any other form of Socialism; but he is unusually sparing of his irony, and scarcely alludes to the rich fund of absurdities with which the prophet might have supplied him. He might at least have alluded to the tame whales which are in future to draw ships through the lemonade sea, or to the light and aromatic bodies in which the ghosts of departed Socialists are to skim around the earth with a motion compounded of swinging, of skating, and of rolling over smooth roads in a well-hung carriage. We believe that the organic theories and political economy of Fourier deserve as much and as little attention as his physical and cosmogonic speculations. He called himself a mathematician; and Grün, although he censures his abuse of mathematical formulæ, in common with many other writers, takes him at his word. We are more inclined to think that, among the numerous defects of his intellect, a want of the power of mathematical reasoning may have been one of the most decided. The claim which he always urged to be considered the demonstrator of *passional attraction*, as Newton of physical, is a proof that he neither understood what Newton had done, nor to what kind of magnitudes calculation was applicable. The use of mathematical symbols and forms in

classifying motives and passions was an error that never could have occurred to a mathematician. Coleridge, who was remarkably incapable even of the study of simple geometry, delighted in applying the forms of the science which he had not penetrated to the metaphysical inquiries to which his genius naturally tended. But the abuse of arithmetic has seldom been carried so far as in the long addition and multiplication sums with which Fourier decorates his whimsical classifications and analogies. When he lays down the rule that the affection of a child = $\frac{1}{3}$ d of the affection of a parent, he only exemplifies his usual abuse of quantitative terms to express qualitative relations.

The tenderness with which the uncompromising critic treats so tempting a victim may probably be ascribed to the consciousness that the Fourierist system is the only elaborate scheme of construction which Socialism has yet produced. Although incapable of standing before the test of severe inquiry, it has at a distance the appearance of a substantive reality to be opposed to the reality of actual civilized life. Its internal incoherence, and the incompleteness with which it carries out social principles, must necessarily be discussed in a work like Grün's; but its inconsistency with the laws of nature, and its practical impossibility, may be more delicately handled. The pyramid may be shown to be imperfect in its proportions without calling attention to the circumstance that it is standing on its point. Some of Fourier's most monstrous fancies, especially his prophecies of fifty-fold production, and unlimited wealth, are too much in the general spirit of the Socialist propaganda, to be unnecessarily censured or refuted. We have already said that the recognition of the economic conditions of the new society implied by Fourier's promised Eldorado is the most rational part of his entire scheme. Even of the bearing of population on wealth he was not entirely ignorant, although the means by which he proposed to regulate it bear the stamp of his strangely constituted brain. In general, Grün takes little notice of the economical laws of the Phalanstère, although he tacitly assumes their possibility.

It is impossible, however, for him to tolerate the maintenance of private property, of money, and of religion, which Fourier attempted to secure. The produce of the Phalanstère is to be subjected to a three-fold distribution according to labour, capital, and talent. Landed proprietors are to be expropriated, but to receive compensation in the shares of the great joint-stock companies into which mankind is to be divided. Of the whole profits the labourer receives the largest share in lieu of wages, and is at the worst secured in the enjoyment of a minimum of income, which, as Fourier announces, will provide him with more luxury

than the richest potentate can now obtain. Next to the labourer's share come the dividends of capital, and lastly the reward of talent, or in other words, the extra payment of skilled labour. It would, however, be an error to suppose that the capitalist and the labourer are necessarily different persons, or that the skilful workman or the poet may not also be a pavier or a street-sweeper. It was the boast of Fourier to supersede civilisation by making labour attractive; and it was with this view that he invented the complicated system of groups and series which seems profound to shallow observers, and which has excited admiration even in the vigorous mind of Proudhon. Twelve passions, five corresponding to the senses, four to the affections, and three which were called, *la cabalistique*, *la papilloniste*, and *la composite*, which we may translate intrigue, caprice, and enthusiasm, were, by these different combinations, to attach each of the 1800 members of the phalanstère to thirty or forty series practising as many different occupations, and subdivided into groups corresponding to the natural divisions of their labours. As the series were to receive the dividends due to labour and talent, and to distribute them through the groups to the individuals, every member of the association would be a receiver under thirty or forty different heads, in addition to his share, if any, as a capitalist.

It requires no extraordinary ingenuity in Grün to show that the position allotted to capital in the new world is equally inconsistent and superfluous. As the minimum, which is to be the first charge on the profits, and which will generally be exceeded, is sufficient to ensure extreme luxury, and as labour is to become a pleasure instead of a trouble, it is difficult to see why the rich should wish to retain their wealth, or how they are to employ it. The claims of talent or skilled labour are still more unreasonable. Where every man, woman, and child follows inclination alone in the choice of work, they can claim no special reward for gratifying their own tastes. Fourier had the negative merit of understanding that if the present motives which lead to production were superseded, other forces must be substituted. With his usual facility he found the requisite impulse in the promised attractiveness of labour; but in retaining the system of payment, and even of proportional payment, he forgot that wages are intended to meet the old-fashioned case of labour which is not in itself so attractive as to be its own reward. His critic is perfectly justified in requiring him to rely on his great discovery of passional attraction, without helping himself out by props taken from an obsolete system of civilisation. Whether labour is in fact attractive, or can be made so, is a question which both Fourier and Grün consider as little as the traditional philosophers regarded the experiment whether the fish would spill the water of the full pail,

when they were discussing the reasons which explained why it did not spill it.

In a similar spirit, he objects to some remnants of prejudice which still disfigure Fourier's singularly liberal views on the emancipation of women. Some honorary privileges allowed to the so called Vestals call forth a just censure on their inconsistency. When inclination is the only rule, one inclination is as much and as little entitled to reward as another. We conjecture that Grün's practical theories on this subject are much more in accordance with right feeling and decorum, than his critical views. He would make inclination the rule of conduct; but he would probably not believe with Fourier that the standard of natural inclination in a healthy state of society corresponded exactly with the practice and principles of the hero of a French novel. But in all his views of society, as well in his tea-garden paradise, with its incessant processions and music and absence of privacy, as in his judgment of women and of their relations to men, Fourier was essentially a Parisian Cockney. And yet this strange enthusiast was possessed with a belief in the truth and practicability of his scheme, which many a sober and cautious reasoner would find it impossible to entertain in the case of the most simple and probable results. In his early works he invited rich capitalists to assist him in establishing a single phalanstère, promising them in return unlimited wealth, and the eternal gratitude of mankind. He announced that he would be at home daily, at twelve o'clock, to receive the proposals which the rich might offer him. No millionaire attended to his call; but year after year Fourier came home daily at the appointed hour, that no default on his part might occasion an obstacle to the easy, and yet impracticable, regeneration of the world, which £50,000 would have realized.

Although Grün is perfectly alive to the absurdity of Fourier's arithmetical abstractions, although he not untruly remarks, that his is the broadest expression of "the egoism of civilisation," he treats him with a respect and deference, which he is by no means inclined to extend to his much abler and more vigorous disciple and successor, Considérant, the now pugnacious editor of the *Démocratie Pacifique*. In an amusing narrative, somewhat after the manner of Heine, of a visit to a Phalansterian meeting, he dwells chiefly on the monotonous ticking of a clock, which first disturbed his nerves, and then illustrated to him the mechanical character of the school. Their conversation appeared to him heavy and flat—commonplace observations mixed with feeble jests, and criticisms which referred all opinions to the standard of Fourierist orthodoxy. At first he thought that the ticking proceeded from the wood on the fire, supposing that among the miracles of Fourierism, wood might have acquired the property

of marking the time ; but as the disciples talked of the heterodoxies of Cabet and of Proudhon, " I almost fainted from ennui ; the magic seemed to have left the room, and I now heard distinctly that it was the clock that ticked, and not the wood ; the scales fell from my eyes. I saw mere ordinary men living on the fat of one, and that a dead man." Considerant's fault in his eyes consists partly in a blind and affected worship of Fourier, but still more in his attempts to conciliate opinion by announcing, on behalf of his school, their indifference to political change—even to the extent of dedicating a book to Louis Philippe himself.

By this time Grün must probably be satisfied that Considerant is by no means restrained either by timidity or constitutional prejudices from advocating revolutionary measures. There is, however, little necessary inconsistency between the pacific arguments of the preacher under the Monarchy, and the summons to arms of the agitator of 1849. We have no doubt that in both cases his object was almost exclusively social. To realize the Phalanstère by bloodshed or by the peaceable influence of the possession of power, was at all times probably Considerant's exclusive object. It is far from impossible that in the chances of French affairs he may even yet have the suicidal fortune of seeing his chimera explode as it comes into contact with reality. Grün, writing at a time when Considerant was flattering the middle classes and the lovers of order, shows with little difficulty the inconsistency of socialist organization with the existing law and the actual polity ; but we may safely believe that the maintenance of Monarchy or of the Charter was never a serious object with the Fourierist leader. In his newer character as a Red Republican, he would probably receive more sympathy from the revolutionary Humanist ; but Grün's condemnation of his real and characteristic opinions would not be revoked. The *Démocratie Pacifique* had given its doctrine the title of Social Liberalism. Messieurs the Fourierists, or liberal Socialists, says Grün, may get themselves buried, " except that they are buried already."

The more popular and political advocates of the organization of labour offer little interest to the German critic. But, in tracing their origin, he takes occasion to give a history of earlier French Socialism, which may be instructive even to those who differ most widely from the writer's opinions. In Morelly, whose *Code de la Nature* was published in 1753, he finds the principal elements of Fourier's social organization, combined with a complete abolition of private property. In the development of his scheme Morelly appears, like L. Blanc and St. Simon, to have unavoidably arrived at the conclusion of the necessity of compelling men to labour, or, as Grün truly says, of making them slaves : " From

Plato to the latest French Socialists they are all tyrants and triflers with human nature,"—a just remark, which will go far to counterbalance all the plausible arguments which may be urged against law and private property, until Grün or Proudhon has proved as well as asserted the power of society to move itself without the agency of individual interest. The Humanist and the Anarchist are in so far profounder than their rivals that they admit the dilemma which nature has established between freedom and equality under every form of civilisation and every theory of socialism but their own. In existing society there is no real equality. In Communism and in St. Simonianism there is no freedom. We have yet to learn that the antinomy can be reconciled by the abolition of law as well as of property; but in the mean time we may profit by the criticism of Grün, though expecting little from his positive philosophy.

After noticing the incomplete and fragmentary socialism of Rousseau and of Mably, the historian naturally proceeds to the practical attempt to realize the doctrines of the *contrat social* which characterized the Revolution. We have already referred to his criticism of Robespierre. He quotes some declamatory phrases of Condorcet's, as to the injustice of the existing distribution of property with a personal sympathy for the writer, which does not blind him to their untenable and irremediable inconsistency with the maintenance of any portion of the actual social system. It is an utter error, he says, to try to patch and palliate the evils of property, by attempting to settle the question within the limits of the social compact. "The organization of labour—a phrase which might have a deep and beautiful meaning, if the organization was combined with a new foundation of society itself—has become an odious French-German copper-coin for journalist-idlers to toss about. Organization of labour forsooth, with excise, with customs, with the possibility of war, in a political world and its magic cauldron, in which constitutionalism, republicanism, and absolutism seethe together—it is fit for Bedlam, for Bicêtre, for Siegburg. Why, who is to organize? The State? Is industry, as well as every thing else, to be given into M. Guizot's hands? * * * To wish for the organization of labour in our present *status quo*, a man must be either a Fourierist or a fool."

This is the true answer to popular dabblers in Socialism. Their new cloth will not suit the world's old garments. The maintenance of private property combined with the abolition of inheritance, subdivision short of equalization, or equalization without perpetual redistribution; the use of money without trade, as in Fourier's scheme, or trading without money, as in some rival theories, are all demonstrable absurdities: and yet any of these

innovations taken separately, is more likely to meet with popular favour than a complete and logical proposal for the entire destruction and reconstruction of society. Louis Blanc's shallow and specious book on the Organization of Labour has imposed upon thousands whom Grün's uncompromising audacity would have frightened and repelled. The German critic treats the French journalist with a good humoured and friendly contempt, little flattering to his intellectual pretensions. M. Blanc's occasional pious sentimentalisms do not escape his notice: "Certainly," he says, "the little rogue has very religious eyes."

His view of Cabet's Communism, which is popularly known from the *Voyage en Icarie*, may easily be anticipated. The abolition of property, and the equalization of enjoyment, might seem to entitle the scheme to his approbation; but the democratic despotism, which, as in all similar Utopian polities, is the main-spring of Icarian society, is as repulsive and as ludicrous to Grün's critical judgment, as to the feelings and associations of ordinary men of the world. From long habits of dictation to admiring disciples, Cabet has become even more minutely vexatious in his legislation, than is the case with reformers generally. He prescribes the very dress of his imaginary subjects, who as his critic observes, might surely in a regenerated world be competent to choose their own. He appoints the age of marriage, the method of education, the very meal-times of the Icarians—above all, he would not only prohibit the freedom of the press, which as he gravely says, cannot be wished for in the Icarian republic, however desirable in oppressive monarchies, but he would have all bad books burnt by a public officer after the traditional fashion which has now become almost obsolete.

Grün supposes himself a citizen of Icaria, and the author of a work on the constitution of that free republic. He must denounce, he says, their slavish education, their slave-press, their slavery in general; he must complain that they are the most wretched and contemptible of mankind, he must compare them with the happier and freer organization of the old world. But he finds that the Republic alone has the right of printing, that he is subject to imprisonment for even writing in so detrimental a spirit. One resource only remains. He will raise an *émeute*, he will overthrow the constitution, he will express his own opinion, and let others express theirs, and the liberated Icarians will send for Heine to compose immoral poems for them—"Arrive ce qui peut, even though a constitutional monarchy should come after the revolution. There are still Coburgs, and Louis Philippe has yet sons unprovided for. The question will be which can make most interest with me, England or France."

The atheistic communism of Dezamy is in Grün's opinion

preferable to Cabet's theory, and he speaks with interest and sympathy of the followers of Babœuf, who would not only prohibit inequality, but destroy cities and works of art, and all the materials and implements of luxury. But it is only on account of the destructive tendency, and the aspirations after anarchy, which characterize these rude sects, that he tolerates their incoherent schemes. They are all founded, he says, on self-interest, or the principle of individual isolation, while Socialism can only be realized by the entire and absolute identification of the inclinations of each, with the interests of all. Among all modern French teachers, he can only find one, who has advocated his favourite principle. Proudhon, the ablest and boldest innovator of the present day, seems in some respects almost to rise to the height of orthodox German Humanism.

The bold paradox that property is theft, has perhaps led to some misapprehension of Proudhon's position. In recognising the right of possession, he seems almost to bring back the proprietary system, which he had rejected, and in retaining the use of money, though for the payment of equal wages to all, as well as in his allowance of penal laws, and his obstinate refusal to make women independent of men, he might appear to have less claim than some of his rivals, to the designation which he assumes for himself, of Anarchist. But this very profession of anarchy, both involves a sound principle, and distinguishes him from the theorists, who would found absolute freedom on the despotism of the greater number. Proudhon holds that the administration of society is strictly a matter of science, and more peculiarly of political economy. To ascertain and not to dictate the laws which govern it, is he thinks the duty of the legislator; and in his own case it is only as far as he believes himself to have mastered the science of legislation, that he undertakes to teach the community. The startling results at which he arrives, by no means affect the soundness of the principle with which he sets out. The temerity and the one-sidedness of the self-taught student, are visible in every part of his system; but he has disposed for ever of much rubbish accumulated by his Socialist predecessors and opponents, and he has established two propositions which might powerfully hinder the accumulation of rubbish hereafter, that the rights of men do not originate in the will, and that the key to social organization is the science of production and consumption.

Grün rejoices in the opportunity of making the French proletariat leader, for the first time, acquainted with the doctrines of Feuerbach, and especially with the euthanasia of philosophy by self-absorption. In his later writings Proudhon has almost entirely renounced the religious residuum which is to be found in

his original Essay on Property. His heresies, in admitting of money, and of positive law, are tolerantly passed over by his friendly critic; and the only point on which they seem finally to have differed was the question of the freedom of women. "You must cook well for Proudhon when he comes to see us," he writes to the female correspondent to whom all his Belgian and French experiences are addressed, "and then you may perhaps convert him, which would be as great a victory as Rosbach; but mind you do not forget your cookery."

When we leave the criticisms of the various Socialist sects, and inquire into the positive opinions of the critic, our task becomes much more difficult. It is no part of Grün's purpose in the work before us to develop the theory of absolute Socialism, by which he tests the incomplete systems of French speculators. He would evidently abolish all legal compulsion at the same time that he annihilates individual self-interest. Nationality he repudiates; political discussions have no interest for him; and he treats the advocates of philanthropic harmony and of self-sacrifice as mere sentimental dreamers. He is too acute not to be aware of the economic difficulty which lies at the heart of the social puzzle; but he cuts the knot by an assertion, which, in its ordinary sense, is so false and shallow, that it would be satisfactory to find some indirect meaning which might be better worth encountering. His favourite doctrine of political economy is, that consumption causes equivalent production; and that the consumption of each is therefore guaranteed by the consumption of all. With mere consumption, he says, the world would die of inanition; with mere production, of a surfeit.

When he illustrates his proposition by examples, he only confirms the first impression of its falsehood and shallowness. The production, he argues, of bread is consumption of all the materials and implements employed; not only of corn, milk, eggs, but of mills, ploughs, carpenters' work, smiths' work, and the rest: so, by the act of reading a book, the paper manufacturer, the typefounder, the printer, and the bookbinder are set in motion. The reader perhaps writes a new book, and so produces more paper, more types, and more work for the artisan. Those who wish thoroughly to understand this mode of reasoning, which is substantially the same with the commonplace argument in favour of luxury and extravagance, that "it is good for trade," will find it fully discussed and exposed in Mill's Political Economy; but the general fallacy is easily understood. The demand for a book may divert capital into the manufacture of types and paper, but it does not furnish the means of producing them. On the contrary, consumption, in all cases, diminishes the means of production. The consumer, as such, is a mere

burden upon society. That the desire of obtaining the means of consumption is the chief occasion of production is undoubtedly true; although, by admitting it, the socialist necessarily lets in all the motives of individual interest which he professes to exclude; but the transfer of the causative power from the human mind to the material relations of produce is a sophism too obvious to be dangerous.

In another passage, with a juster appreciation of the real point at issue, Grün borrows from Liebig a much stranger proof of his dogma, that consumption and production are necessarily correlative and equal. Without attaching our belief to his assertion, and passing by the confession of helplessness involved in the dependence of the fundamental doctrine of Socialist economy on the alien science of chemistry, we may observe, that the relation can at most hold good between the consumption and production of food. Liebig may prove that as grass produces beef, so oxen produce grass; but he will scarcely tell any Socialist reformer that sleep has any tendency to produce feather-beds, or that our study of Grün's book has in any way provided the elements necessary for casting future types. As far as we can understand it, the only positive value of this part of the Socialist scheme consists in the admission that there is an economic question to be solved; while a not less valuable negative conclusion may be drawn from the entire failure of the writer to produce a solution.

An inquiry into the positive philosophical ground of Humanistic Socialism, would require far more abstruse investigations. At first sight it might seem that theories concerning law and property might be independent of opinions on religion and philosophy amounting to the negation of both. But when we find so acute a reasoner as Grün invariably asserting the identity of his theoretical belief with his practical conclusions, and rejecting every form of French Socialism in succession, on the ground that they all fall short of the scientific completeness of Humanism, and when we know that in common with other German writers of his school, he looks up to Feuerbach as the great Socialist teacher, we cannot but feel desirous to know his real meaning, whatever may be the reasons by which he supports it.

We are not aware that Feuerbach has himself treated directly of the question of property, although in an oracular aphorism he makes a socialist confession of faith. "What are my principles? *Ego* and *Alter Ego*—Egoism and Communism; for the two are as inseparable as the head and heart—without Egoism you have no head—without Communism no heart." * The ge-

* Fragmente zur Charakteristik meiner Philosophischen *Curriculum vitae*. Feuerbach, Werke, vol. ii. p. 413.

neral purpose of his writings is correctly indicated by another still more concise apothegm, "No religion!—is my religion; No philosophy!—is my philosophy."* The merit, however, which is claimed for him in both departments of inquiry is not that of simple negation, but of having resolved into their original elements the forms of thought or of belief with which he has undertaken to deal. Atheism, in the language of his school, is only an incomplete transition from Theism, admitting as it does the subjective possibility of the being to whom it denies objective reality. The Humanist derives his name from the doctrine that in human nature is to be found the whole content of religion, as well as the impulses and feelings to which religion appeals. His creed, commencing with the extreme of anthropomorphism, proceeds to declare the Deity formed after the image of man to be the man himself, who had been projected beyond himself by a kind of optical delusion of the imagination. To him heaven is a mere idealized reflection of earth, and the Divine Attributes are generalizations of the qualities of the human mind. In the same manner Feuerbach undertakes to remove the dualism of spirit and matter, of soul and body, and to resolve all philosophical categories, all *entia rationis* into sensible qualities of the objects of sensuous perception. He professes to recognise the conclusions of philosophers, to admit that Pantheism legitimately followed from Theism, and to be only interpreting the meaning of Pantheism and Idealism, when he ends philosophy where it began, with an appeal to the senses as certain and final. It is thus that no philosophy serves him for a theory, and no religion for a faith; or, at least, this summary of his doctrines, hasty and superficial as it unavoidably is, seems to correspond with the principles to which Grün constantly refers as the basis of his political and social system.

The transition from theoretical to practical or Socialistic Humanism, seems to consist in the inference that if human nature is the sole and absolute reality, it must also be self-sufficing, and subject only to its own spontaneous control. If religion and philosophy can be resolved into mere human qualities and forms of thought, the same analysis will scarcely fail to reabsorb the external sanctions of law and authority into the sovereign individuality from which they must be supposed to have proceeded. Man, according to this system, has mistaken what is highest in himself for something above himself, and the will, which is his dominant faculty, for an external and positive barrier to his inclinations. As in a dream, he is hampered on all sides with obstructions which proceed from his own imagination. The Humanist proposes to liberate him by showing that the phantoms

* Ibid., p. 414.

which haunt him are a part of himself, and that not only the commands of others, but his own past resolutions, together with all doctrines and dogmas which have influenced his conscience or his practice, are chimeras which will no longer control his will, as soon as he is fully awake to the truth. To the emancipated Socialist, the will of a majority will be no more binding than the commands of a usurping despot, nor will a law to which he has consented bind him otherwise than if it had been imposed by force. To him the desires and opinions of others are merely external forces; his own former determinations are dead abstractions, the cast off slough of his present and living self. If Feuerbach is rightly interpreted by his disciple Grün, he would add to his confession of faith, "No morality!—is my morality; No law!—is my law."

As his master admits and adopts the conclusions of Spinoza, of Kant, or of Hegel, before proceeding to resolve them into abstractions and non-entities, Grün, as we have seen, regards with various degrees of favour all the schools of Socialism, which he finally condemns. St. Simonianism is welcome to him for its tampering with property; Fourier anticipates him in the rehabilitation of sensualism; Proudhon's acuter understanding has led him to a partial negation of external laws, which it remained for Humanism to complete:—all the sects agree in the attempt to modify society by shifting its actual centre of gravitation. We have little fault to find with his proofs of the incompleteness common to all the Socialist schemes, and of the arbitrary nature of the limits within which these innovations have been confined. The Humanist theory, as far as we are aware, is the most advanced form which Socialism has hitherto assumed. It is relieved from many of the inconsistencies, and from some of the objections which may be found among more timid speculators. It retains no incompatible elements borrowed from the existing world; and it is free from the despotism which in almost all Utopian schemes is substituted for the action of individual interest. We have yet to learn that it is practicable; that society is possible with absolute freedom, and that self-interest can either be annihilated by ignoring its existence, or dispensed with as the moving power of the economic world. The entirely untrue proposition that consumption is production, is a buoy placed to indicate an impassable reef, on which all Socialist expeditions have hitherto been wrecked if they attempted to cross it. But notwithstanding these defects, Humanistic Socialism is, we believe, the most dangerous opponent which threatens the existence of property. It has not yet prevailed against the ancient faith, but it has swallowed the rods of the other magicians.

We have not dwelt on the popular arguments, or rather illus-

trations of the arguments against Socialism. They may be found more or less forcibly urged in well-known publications, such as Thiers' *Essay on Property*, and Barante's *Questions Constitutionnelles*. Their office is to influence popular opinion and to confirm the wavering adherents of property. Against thoroughgoing speculators on social regeneration they can have little effect; for they generally assume the present state of society as their point of view, and they raise mere objections of detail to the changes which are proposed. The day-dreamer, like Fourier, would meet their statements with a denial, the uncompromising Humanist would admit that all changes are inconvenient, and that partial changes would lead to confusion. The theorist who has satisfied himself of the general justice and practicability of Socialism, will never be deterred from the attempt to realize his schemes by mere inconveniences in practice. If any advocate of existing civilisation can either deduce by his own reasoning, or find in the theories of his opponents the ultimate form, the logical consequence and completion of Socialism, he will at least have a tangible enemy to grapple with, a definite and measurable force to overcome. If he can say to the discontented multitudes who once believed in political democracy, and now in social regeneration, this is the embodiment of your aspirations, and to their teachers, this is the essence of your doctrines, it will remain to show that the conclusion which he attacks is repugnant to reason and inconsistent with experience. It is possible that the question may not be yet ripe even for theoretical decision; but speculation must be prepared to keep in advance of practice, or the old world may be destroyed before the existence of the Utopia which is to take its place has been finally affirmed or denied.

In the mean time the agitation of Socialist theories sufficiently explains the failure of all recent attempts to establish Constitutional Governments on the Continent. The purposeless character of merely democratic changes has been recognised by the great body of the democracy. Their leaders are either chosen for their advocacy of Socialism, or compelled, like Ledru Rollin, and many other political agitators, to adopt its language. Proudhon, Considérant, and Leroux, have sat in the French Assembly; Fröbel was a member of the Frankfort Parliament; Grün himself belonged to the extreme left of the Prussian Legislative Assembly. Discussions on public measures for the maintenance of order and for the security of property are shared in by those who openly profess to wish for the overthrow of order as the first step to the destruction of property. It is idle to suppose that such discrepancies can be reconciled by debating, or by voting. Proudhon smiled when the Constituent Assembly unanimously censured his scheme of taxation, as he had smiled when the

Besançon Academy repudiated the Essay on Property which he had dedicated to them. The Assembly and the Academy were to him alike—instruments of publicity. He had no wish to convince the members of either body. As long as the advocates of property are stronger than their opponents, Socialism must either confine itself to literary proselytism, or descend into the streets and fight. Parliamentary discussions between irreconcilable enemies are soon felt by all parties to be useless. Considérant, who has a thousand times declared his contempt for all Constitutions, and his abhorrence of the actual form of society, was a member of the Committee which composed the French Constitution of 1848. In 1849, under prosecution for treason, he is in a much more natural position.

The present tendency of Socialist politics may be collected from a recent publication by Bruno Bauer, who was probably, to judge from internal evidence, the author of the manifesto of the German democrats, which appeared in the newspapers about the time of the insurrection in the Bavarian Palatinate. "*Die Bürgerliche Revolution in Deutschland*" is a violent party pamphlet, containing a retrospect of the agitations in Church and State, which have excited various parts of Germany during seven or eight years. Bauer attributes the movement of Ronge in the Catholic Church, and of the so-called Friends of Light among the Protestants, as well as the more serious political disturbances of 1848, to a class which he personifies as the *Bürger*, the citizens, or men of the middle classes, with whose discontent and desire of change he professedly sympathizes. Yet the whole pamphlet consists of one continuous sneer at the liberal, reforming, revolutionary *Bürger*. He is described as a purposeless, timid, envious opponent of all superiority, anxious only to bring all things down to his own commonplace level. He is taunted with his incapacity to contend against the intrigues of the Governments, with his moderation in the Frankfort and Berlin Assemblies, and even with the violence with which he sometimes struggled to acquire power, which he was afterwards incapable of using. In his hatred and contempt for his allies, the revolutionist writer concludes with an almost direct invitation to the King of Prussia to take the place of the incompetent liberals, and, by large social changes, justify the re-assumption of the absolute power which had escaped from his grasp. In general, it may be said that the indignation of the Socialist agitators is at present chiefly directed against the middle classes, against Constitutional Governments, and even against strictly political democracy. Conscious that they must obtain all if they would gain anything, they boldly proclaim their irreconcilable enmity to the whole system of existing society. Modifications of property or political concessions

have no value to them, except as steps to the accomplishment of their wishes. In their contest against a system incompatible with their principles, they refuse to listen to compromise ; and it is difficult to say that they are in the wrong.

It may, indeed, be argued that every social and political scheme which has yet existed has been, in some degree, a compromise. The limitations which law and custom have imposed on property are so numerous and so extensive that Proudhon has inferred from them the paradoxical conclusion that property in principle is not recognised by law. Again, it may be said, that in every association for the purposes of business or pleasure the principle of Socialism is, to some extent, practically at work. Government offices, armies, and corporations, are all socially organized bodies, in which the duty of functionaries is substituted for the individual activity of free competition. In the family, above all, the Icarian formula is realized : service is rendered according to the capacity of every member, and distribution apportioned to his wants.

It is perfectly true that competition has in many cases developed itself in co-operative associations, and that some practical objects are more effectually promoted by discipline and subordination than by individual and voluntary activity. In small bodies, as in convents or in families, authority or affection may supply the power which universal Socialism has yet to discover ; and finally, in the servitudes and burdens already imposed upon property, the germ of the principle which would vest all property in society at large, may, with moderate ingenuity, be discovered. But none of these things have been the product of logic or of system : they have shown themselves as unconscious results of experience ; they have opened their own channels and marked their own boundaries : and if they prove that a socialistic element is involved in the existing system, they cannot prove its right to preponderance. The advocates of individual freedom must acquiesce in its results, even though they end in Socialism. Voluntary, deliberate, compulsory Socialism, with all the instruments used in establishing it, they renounce and oppose. England, with its natural and occasional growth of institutions, with its habitual disregard of verbal logic, may long succeed in opposing indifference to the propaganda of Socialism. The ready-made Constitutions of the Continent are more obviously open to its inroads. Professedly founded on abstract truth and justice, they will be required to follow out their own principles to the last. We know not how far a compliance with such a demand might lead. It is enough to say, that the revolutionary masses throughout Europe are rapidly approaching to the conviction, that the extreme anarchy of Humanism is implicitly admitted in the declaration of the rights of man.

ART. V.—*The Ten Years' Conflict: Being the History of the Disruption of the Church of Scotland.* By ROBERT BUCHANAN, D.D. In Two Volumes. 1849.

THERE are some subjects so purely national, or that take so thoroughly the aspect of national character, that it is always extremely difficult, and in some cases impossible, to render them distinctly intelligible to people of other nations. Men are, nevertheless, attractively drawn to the study of such subjects, however unintelligible they may seem. They have one common principle—human nature. Man and his hopes and fears, his desires and aversions, his joys and sorrows—these form the common subject, with which all mankind can hold some measure of sympathy, however diversified they may seem, by force of circumstances or peculiarities of character. Yet in many instances the attraction awakens little more than curiosity; and when that has been gratified, we are ready to turn away from the peculiar exhibition which we have beheld of our common humanity, without duly considering whether it might have been possible for us to have learned some important lesson from what we have witnessed. It was, we think, in some such mood of mind, with half-awakened curiosity, yet deeming the matter to be too exclusively national to be very intelligible, that the British public regarded the recent Ecclesiastical conflict in Scotland, and when it seemed ended by the Disruption and the consequent rise of the Free Church, ceased to pay any farther attention to the event, and derived little or no permanent instruction from what had taken place so unexpectedly.

British Statesmen in other days were accustomed to act differently. When any strange event took place in any part of Europe, powerfully arousing the mind and action of any community, they were wont to inquire into the nature of the principle by which that community had been actuated and impelled, with the view of regulating their own procedure in accordance with what they judged its truth and power. Queen Elizabeth was no republican, nor were the members of her administration favourable to republican principles; but when the philosophical penetration of Sir Philip Sidney enabled him to discover the real nature and power of the principle which had aroused and was knitting into one the entire mind and heart of the Dutch provinces, that wise princess and her ministry felt no difficulty in estimating aright its unconquerable energy, and in resolving accordingly to enter into friendly relations with the struggling Republic, though they had no such design as that of introducing

its principles into England. British Statesmen in our day might have wisely followed a similar course, when they perceived that the mind and heart of Scotland were so strongly stirred, on subjects at least apparently of the same nature with those which in other days had proved invincible to power and imperishable to time. But there was no modern Sir Philip Sidney to question and understand the spirit which had so strongly taken possession of the mind of Scotland. What has been done cannot be reversed; but it may still be wise to record fully the whole memorable conflict, and to endeavour to ascertain its real nature, and so far as may be possible, to estimate its bearing on the near, or more remote future—not in the spirit of narrow-minded partisanship, either for approbation or disapprobation, but for the purpose of attempting to assign to it the position and value which it may seem rightfully to deserve.

Perhaps the most favourable position for taking a calm and dispassionate view of any subject which deeply agitates the Scottish mind, is that which might be occupied by a native of Scotland, adequately acquainted with its history, civil and ecclesiastical, but who had resided in another country long enough to have learned to contemplate Scottish questions without prejudice, yet with true sympathy. Such a position the writer is in some measure qualified to take—how fully, or otherwise, our readers will soon be able to judge.

The history of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland cannot be rightly understood without a clear conception of the primary position which the Reformed Church of Scotland took, or attempted to take. It is one thing to attempt to ascertain what that position was, and quite another to undertake its defence; the former falls within our province, the latter we leave to those to whom it belongs. At the very commencement of the Scottish Reformation it had every public influence to encounter—the sovereign and the court, the Romish priesthood, a proud and rapacious nobility, and the stormy turbulence of a hitherto rude and ill-governed community. But the Scottish Reformers were men of strong faith. They believed in the Word of God, and in all the great truths and principles which they found therein contained. They placed implicit confidence in the certainty that these truths and principles must ultimately triumph; and with the direct earnestness of strong-minded and dauntless men, they proclaimed aloud, incessantly, and everywhere, those Scriptural truths and principles which they so firmly believed, and on the invincible strength of which they so confidently relied. But in order that truths and principles may conquer, they must be known and believed. In order that external opposition may be successfully encountered, an internal power—the power of enlightened

conscience and public opinion—must be evoked. Hence the earnest and strenuous exertions made by the Scottish Reformers to place the School alongside the Church, and thus to make the benefits of a sound religious education completely national, thereby securing an enlightened public opinion, at once truly religious and truly national.

It is not necessary to ascribe to John Knox and his fellow-reformers such an amount of foresight as to have been fully aware of all the consequences of this educational movement. It is apparent from the writings of Knox himself that he felt the "godly upbringing of the youth" to be a sacred duty, to the right discharge of which too much attention could not be paid. And as he had no respect for, nor confidence in, what he called the "rascal multitude," he could not fail to be actuated by a sincere desire to raise that multitude into a higher and more enlightened condition, in which they would be more able to profit by the instructions of himself and others. But, at the same time, whether he was fully aware of it or not, there was in his system an element of vast power and great hopefulness, so far as the Scottish mind was concerned, and to which that mind was already, in one sense, singularly predisposed. The idea of national independence had been worked into the Scottish mind so long and so completely by the protracted wars with England, that it had become not only a national feeling, but a national passion. Now it is not difficult for the national and the personal to change positions, or be transmuted; the national becoming the personal by concentration, or the personal becoming the national by aggregation. The preaching of the Gospel, as the Scottish Reformers preached it, proclaimed to every man spiritual freedom so far as regarded the control of any created being,—therefore freedom from the yoke of Rome,—therefore freedom from any earthly power in religious matters. This could not but adapt itself to the deepest and mightiest sympathies of a strong-minded, brave, and independent people. Accordingly it took possession of their hearts at once, and for ever. It drew into itself all that was most determined and energetic in the national character. It became itself the very soul and essence of the national character, as it has continued ever since to be, whether fully understood or not, either by those whose minds it moulded, or by those against whom it strove.

This thought might be traced much further, and shown to be the true key to the leading peculiarities of Scottish character and history. It might be shown, for instance, to have been the power which put an end to the horrors of the feudal system in Scotland, which its Kings had in vain attempted to abolish or mitigate. Not till after the Scottish people had become spiri-

tually free, and knew how to value that freedom, did the Scottish Barons lose the dread power of "pit and gallows," which they had previously possessed. This appears even from the prolonged existence of that petty but most oppressive tyranny in those regions into which the light and liberty of reformed religion most slowly penetrated,—as in some of the Border districts, and in the Highlands generally. Those parts of the country became earliest and most completely free on which the Scottish Church laid first and most powerfully "the strong hand of her purity." But this course of inquiry every reader of Scottish history may prosecute for himself; for us to follow it further would be to diverge unwarrantably from our present subject.

During the period of John Knox's active and vigorous life and struggles, it does not very clearly appear that any of the contending parties had fully explored, and learned accurately to understand, the exact nature of the positions which they respectively occupied. There was, to a considerable degree, mutual distrust, if not antagonism, between the Church and the State. So long as the conflict with Rome was dangerous, there was apparently the most cordial co-operation between the "Lords of the Congregation," as the Reforming nobility were termed, and the Ministers; but when the peril of Roman ascendancy ceased to be formidable, the nobility not only united to seize the lion's share of the booty, but also began to regard with jealousy the influence in the nation which the Ministers had obtained by their zeal and ability. The course of conduct on which the Court party now entered was both injudicious and too late. The mighty element of public opinion had been created, and was steadily advancing. The old feeling and principle of national independence had been transmuted and glorified into the feeling and principle of spiritual independence. And as the principle of national independence, while it upheld Scotland in her long wars against a foreign monarch's attempted usurpations, only tended to confirm her allegiance to her own; so the principle of spiritual independence, while it resisted every aggression upon what was regarded as the rightful province of the Head and King of the Church, tended at the same time to make the Scottish people often even punctiliously exact in rendering the allegiance which they believed to be due in civil matters to their earthly sovereign. John Erskine of Dun felt it to be neither contradictory nor disloyal to say to the Regent Mar, "There is a spiritual jurisdiction and power which God has given unto His Kirk, and to them that bear office therein; and there is a temporal jurisdiction and power given of God to kings and civil magistrates. Both the powers are of God, and most agreeing to the fortifying one of the other, if they be right used." *Mar*

did Andrew Melville consider himself as speaking treason, when he said to the King, "There are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James, the head of the Commonwealth; and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member."

It is manifest that both Erskine and Melville held it to be perfectly possible to reconcile obedience to civil authority with the spiritual independence of the Church. Nor is there anything so self-contradictory in this as many seem to suppose. Let them even be regarded as antagonist powers; it is not unphilosophical to regard antagonist powers as not only mutually beneficial, but often even necessary to each other's existence—constituting the counterbalancing poles of created being. Even Scripture seems to indicate the same thought by the juxtaposition of the precepts, "Fear God; honour the king." We are inclined, however, to think that the expression, "*spiritual independence*," is not happily chosen for the purpose of conveying a clear conception of the idea which it was intended to embody. The language already quoted from Erskine and Melville—language equally current among their contemporary countrymen—introduces us pretty distinctly to the thought which occupied their minds. The kingly authority, as they regarded it, was one which admitted no rival within its own proper domain. True and full allegiance to that authority involved equally true and full independence of every other authority within that kingdom. To the Scottish mind of that period, the idea of Scottish independence meant the most true and loyal obedience to their own king, but the most entire independence with regard to every other king on earth. The idea of national independence was therefore identical with the idea of allegiance to their own sovereign. And as they had first obtained spiritual liberty by becoming acquainted with the principles and laws of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, their obedience to him naturally took the form, as it adopted the Scriptural language, of allegiance to a spiritual king, whose laws and authority were sole and exclusive within his spiritual kingdom. They thus conceived, or rather *felt*, at once the principle of entire and unreserved allegiance to Christ, as the sole Head and King of his spiritual kingdom, the Church. They did not feel that this principle necessarily interfered with their natural allegiance to their natural king, in everything which pertained to his civil supremacy. But as their allegiance to their Scottish king bound them to maintain the independence of Scotland against English invasions; so they naturally spoke of maintaining the independence of the Church, when they meant to express their feeling and principle of sole and entire allegiance

to Christ. It has often seemed to us that the Scottish idea of "spiritual independence," as we understand it, and as we think their own history displays it, would be more distinctly expressed by some such phrase as, "Freedom to serve Christ alone, by full obedience to his laws as contained in the sacred Scriptures," than by the somewhat haughty-sounding and defiant words generally employed.

At the risk of running into another digression, we would suggest to our readers to apply this idea to the explanation of the conduct of the Scottish Covenanters. At one time we see them mustered in hostile array on the boundary line between Scotland and England, prepared to repel the approach of him whom they nevertheless still addressed as their king. Soon afterwards we see that same monarch received into the palace of Holyrood, and hailed with shouts of joyful loyalty. Ere long we see a Scottish army entering England, and taking part in the war between the king and his English Parliament on the side of the latter power. Again we see them contending fiercely against Cromwell in behalf of that king, and also of his unprincipled and licentious son. How can these things be reconciled? It may not be possible to reconcile them; but they may be explained by the principle which led the Covenanters to resist their earthly king, when he strove to invade a spiritual kingdom over which he had no right to reign; and to peril both life and civil liberty in the loyal defence of that king when they saw his rightful sovereignty assailed by one whom they regarded as a usurper. They had drawn for their own guidance—or at least they thought they had drawn—a clear line of distinction between civil and spiritual jurisdiction—between the "two kings and two kingdoms,"—and they were equally loyal to both, prepared to defend the rights and prerogatives of either, as each was in turn assailed. They may have erred in both instances; that point we do not presume to decide; but their conduct appears to us quite intelligible when we view it as the result of their own principle, applied as circumstances seemed to require.

There is in the Scottish character one leading element which must be taken into account by all who wish to understand the history of the people. It may be regarded as shy and proud reserve—or as grave and earnest thoughtfulness—or as the cautious and prudent silence of self-controlling mental firmness. View it as we may, it is there, giving to the Scottish character an air of austerity and sternness, indicating the existence within the heart and mind of deep-seated and powerful principles or passions which it would not be safe to rouse, nor easy to conquer. On such a character nothing merely formal or superficial could exercise any strong or permanent influence. Popery never

seems to have acquired any other power over the Scottish mind than that which arose from the superstitious dread of futurity under the consciousness of guilt. But when Christianity was brought into close contact with the Scottish mind, through the direct application of its profound evangelical truths and principles, and by means of its embodiment in the strong, practical, and life-like form of Presbyterianism, it became at once a vigorous reality which must be loved or hated, embraced or rejected, but could not be treated with indifference or despised. The inevitable consequence was that the strength of Scottish thought and feeling became concentrated on the relations subsisting, or which ought to subsist between the "two kingdoms," the spiritual and the temporal, and on the nature and boundaries of their respective jurisdictions. For the very same reason, in the long struggle which ensued, the characteristics of the contending parties became more and more distinctly apparent. On the one side were to be seen chiefly the men of strong and deep religious faith and practice, stiffening at times into what their antagonists termed bigotry and fanaticism. On the other, chiefly men of the world, courtiers, politicians, people of lax principle and morality, in whose minds the desire of self-aggrandisement or pleasure predominated, degenerating at times into what their opponents termed godlessness and debauchery. During the long conflict, however, the boundaries could not always be distinct. There must needs have been, as there doubtless was, a "debatable land," across which parties might be seen moving in different directions at different times, and under varying banners. There were men of fiery and ambitious character, like Montrose, at one time engaged on the side of the Covenant, at another on that of the king; and men of timid, hesitating, or scrupulous character, like Lorn and Hamilton, at one time espousing the cause of the king, at another that of the Covenant. But in general the distinctive characteristics of the respective parties must have been such as we have described. This, their mutual accusations of each other, doubtless exaggerated and distorted on both sides, is amply sufficient to prove; and we read history ill if, while we set aside much of the criminary language of keen partisans, we do not carefully ascertain the real truth which constituted the living and actuating power on each side. Religious faith, lodged deep in earnest and strong minds, but misunderstood by its antagonists, was on the one side; worldly, political, and selfish prudence, in minds equally strong and resolute, severely if not harshly condemned by its antagonists, was on the other. Between such parties there could be no safe compromise, no harmonious alliance, no lasting peace. Between such parties there may be personal peace—there may be the in-

terchange of the common courtesies and amenities of public and social life; but between the principles which animate and govern their innermost being, there can be nothing but a war of extermination. In completion of this view it must be remarked, what cannot have escaped the notice of every intelligent reader of Scottish ecclesiastical history, that every one of the periods in which the peculiar Presbyterianism of Scotland assumed the ascendancy, had been preceded, and was generally accompanied by a remarkable and manifest increase, not only of avowed religious belief, but of that moral improvement in the habits and manners of the people which bears indisputable evidence of the reality of a moral change within. Such was the period which preceded the ratification of Presbyterian Church government in 1592—such was the period which preceded the signing of the Covenant in 1638, and accompanied the full development of its principles after 1649—such was the period for some years before, and for a considerable time after the Revolution settlement in 1690,—and such, many will say, was the period which preceded and accompanied the recent conflict that rent the Church asunder, separating once more the “two kingdoms,” which it has never yet been found practicable to combine or bring into a peaceful connexion on equal terms.

Taking the position which we have attempted to point out, and which seems to be the central and essential element of these long Scottish controversies, we seem to obtain a commanding view of the whole, in all their varied aspects, and with regard to both of the contending parties. Neither of them seem ever to have made full allowance for the position occupied and views entertained by the other. Hence constant misunderstandings and misrepresentations, by which the strife was embittered and perpetuated. Kings and courtiers, and secular politicians, could not understand the existence and laws of that other spiritual King and kingdom, of which they could be no more than subjects. They could not conceive how the spiritual independence (or the exclusive freedom to obey another King and His laws) of that kingdom could be compatible with due allegiance to an earthly monarch; and this claim of spiritual independence they stigmatized as rebellion. They were incessantly haunted and terrified by the phantom of an *imperium in imperio*, and this they were resolved to prevent. The easiest, and also the most effectual method by which this could be done, without engaging in direct persecution, was by obtaining the power of appointing the administrators of that kingdom, through whom its government might be kept in a state of actual subordination to the civil power. This was very readily perceived by a monarch so cunning as King James, and to obtain this object he directed all the

artifices of his "king-craft." The conflict between the two jurisdictions, civil and spiritual, thus became concentrated or contracted into a contest respecting the right of appointment to the office of the Christian ministry. This, though probably unavoidable, was doubtless unfortunate, inasmuch as it often tended greatly to obscure the real merits of the controversy, if not in the minds of the leading disputants on either side, at least to the perception of a considerable portion of the community, and of half-observant spectators in other countries. The same fatality has hung over it all along. It has been thought a contest about a comparatively insignificant affair; yet it has been waged with such determined energy and perseverance as to prove that it was by no means insignificant in the eyes of the combatants. Nor indeed was it insignificant in reality; for upon it depended the fixing of the principle which should determine the whole of the questions relating to the connexion of Church and State.

Did our limits permit, it would be interesting to retain for a little the position which we have attempted to assume, and from it, as from a watch-tower, cast our eyes over the field of Scottish controversy from the time when that field was occupied by John Knox and his opponents till the present day, marking the successive evolutions of both parties, and the flux and reflux of the conflict. The struggle begins on the most extended scale, and while the whole field is not only open but covered by a variety of forces, John Knox has to encounter the Romish priesthood, the Court and its influence, and the auxiliary forces of France. He advances boldly and irresistibly against the main position of his antagonists, overthrows the Popedom, paralyzes the courtiers, and expels the foreign power. But time is not allowed him to secure the full fruits of victory. The entanglements of his own position have not been cleared away; and the boundaries have not been drawn with sufficient precision between the spiritual kingdom which he sought to establish and the temporal kingdom whose rightful powers he did not wish to impair. The idea of "two kings and two kingdoms" is enunciated, and becomes the essence of the dispute, though the war seems to relate only to the boundaries. Andrew Melville takes up the leader's truncheon and advances with firm and fearless step to "rid the marches." He passes, or seems to pass the boundary, is captured, his friends beaten back, and the line which he had traced is obliterated by the craft and power of the earthly king who is now sustained and enforced by England's wealth and strength.

Still the idea of the "two kings and kingdoms" survives. The subjects of the spiritual kingdom retain their loyalty to both Sovereigns: they obey their earthly monarch in all that pertains to his rightful dominion, for so their heavenly King had com-

manded ; but they maintain their allegiance to Him also by consenting to suffer wrong and injury rather than directly violate His laws. Defeated, cast down, depressed, they endure all with resolute patience, for they are not in despair—they are but waiting His time for deliverance. In a rash hour the earthly king attempts to change the form of Divine worship. This is immediately regarded as a sinful interference with the prerogative of the heavenly King; and His subjects believe that they would be guilty of violating their allegiance to Him, were they to obey. They are threatened with force ; they meet that threat with other force, sterner and more invincible. They embody their idea of the "two kings and two kingdoms" in the form of a Covenant, in which, with no small degree of precision, the boundaries of the "two kingdoms" are drawn, and the prerogatives of the "two kings" asserted and maintained. But the idea, though expressed in language, could not at that time be realized in fact. In vain did the grave majestic eloquence, and senatorial wisdom of Alexander Henderson plead and direct ; in vain did the learning, the genius, and the logical acumen of George Gillespie argue ; in vain did the deep piety and fervent love of Samuel Rutherford supplicate and glow. The position occupied by the Covenanters was not understood by either friends or foes. They were too loyal to their earthly king to retain the friendship of the English Republicans ; and too loyal to their heavenly King to be able to join the cavaliers. Distrusted, forsaken, betrayed, they were again overborne, and soon afterwards exposed to all the fiery terrors of a long and relentless persecution.

The tempest at length ceased. The Revolution of 1688 secured the civil and religious liberties of Britain ; and in Scotland, the triumph of Presbyterian principles seemed to be complete, in consequence of the arrangement which left the appointment of its office-bearers within the sole jurisdiction of the Church. But the jealousy which had been raised in the minds of statesmen and politicians by the idea of the "two kings and two kingdoms" remained. When the union between England and Scotland was about to take place, the spiritual independence of the Church, or freedom to serve Christ alone in spiritual matters, was secured as firmly as the most solemn international treaties could secure it ; not by being included among the Articles of the Union, but by being made the very basis of the Union, without which it could not take place. The boundaries of the "two kingdoms" seemed to be not only defined, but circumvallated and intrenched, so that neither should be able to encroach upon the territories of the other. But within four years after the Union, the State renewed the old encroachment, by seizing again upon the power of appointing the office-bearers and administrators of the spiri-

tual kingdom. It is interesting to remark, that in this instance, as before in the case of the Covenanters, the Church suffered violence in consequence of the unshaken loyalty of its members to their earthly sovereign. We learn from the *Memoirs of Lockhart of Carnwath*, that Queen Anne's Act restoring Patronage was pressed by the intrigues of the Jacobite party, in the hope of provoking Scottish Presbyterians to rebel against the Government which had done a deed so unconstitutional, and to join those who were plotting for the restoration of the exiled Stuart dynasty. This treacherous hope was frustrated by the very strength of the Scottish idea of the "two kings and two kingdoms," which enabled Scottish Presbyterians to maintain the civil allegiance due to their earthly sovereign, while they complained of, and protested against, the wrongful invasion of the spiritual kingdom.

But the boundary having been broken down, the encroachments went on, and the civil element which had been introduced into the administration of the spiritual kingdom did its work. For a time, the Scottish people continued to complain of their religious grievances; and so long as the Church continued also to complain, and to seek redress, they suffered patiently and in hope. When the Church itself began to act in accordance with the aggressive influence of the civil power, the hope of redress grew fainter and fainter. The people ceased to complain. Secession after secession took place. It began to become apparent that the "two kingdoms" were undergoing a process of gradual separation, which might end in the most disastrous consequences. On a sudden, near the close of last century, the French Revolution startled Europe, shook the nations from their lethargic repose, and tried severely the stability of every kingdom. Statesmen soon found, most unexpectedly it may be supposed, that those ministers who were designated Evangelical, who espoused the popular view of ecclesiastical affairs, and were most opposed to all civil encroachments on the province of religious rights and privileges, had not only the greatest influence over the people, but were themselves and their people the most loyal subjects in the nation, the firmest supporters of constitutional authority, and the most determined and steady opponents of revolutionary violence and misrule. This, too, was the direct result of their clear and all-regulating idea of the "two kings and two kingdoms;" and though statesmen did not understand their principle, they applauded its effects. Greater favour began accordingly to be shown to that section of the Church; not that their peculiar principles were better understood by politicians than before, but that the long-cherished jealousy and distrust had begun to abate, in consequence of their proved loyalty, and their zeal in the cause of social peace and order. The result was inevitable. Ancient

principles were resuscitated, and resumed their power. To this the publication of the *Lives of Knox and Melville*, by the late Dr. McCrie, contributed in no small degree. More than twenty years ago, men of thoughtful minds, who from their speculative watch-towers, had been observing the rise, growth, and progress of opinion, began to entertain the expectation that the old contest between the "two kings and two kingdoms" was about to be renewed, and that, too, in circumstances when the contest would probably end in something more decisive than had ever before taken place.

In 1833 the conflict began in good earnest. For some time before matters had been assuming a serious aspect, indicative of a near impending and dangerous struggle between the two parties that divided the Church. The next year, 1834, saw the ascendancy acquired by those who assumed to be the representatives of Knox, Melville, and Henderson, holding the same principles, and resolved to carry them into effect. For a short time it might have seemed to be merely an ecclesiastical conflict between two parties of rival churchmen for the possession of power in Church Courts. And so, indeed, it was regarded by many, even in Scotland itself. But we have the means of knowing that there were some Scotchmen, acquainted with the character of their countrymen and their Church, who, though residing in another land, formed from the first a very different anticipation of what would almost certainly ensue. Such men believed that, though to a superficial observer it might seem to be but a struggle among ecclesiastics for power, it was in reality the recommencement of the old conflict between the "two kings and two kingdoms." And in a short time so it proved. The well-known Auchterarder Case raised anew the controversy respecting the power of appointing the administrators of the spiritual kingdom. For a while the real nature of the contest was concealed by the use of the conventional terms, "intrusion" and "non-intrusion." But when the Civil Courts assumed the power of determining the whole matter, the jurisdiction of the Church Courts and all, the controversy was forced to assume its true character, as in reality involving the very essence of the spiritual independence of the Church. From the moment when it took that aspect and designation, it could not be very doubtful to any thoughtful onlooker what would be the issue. Secular politicians were again startled by the dread of an *imperium in imperio*. Judges were horrified by the idea of co-ordinate jurisdiction, and of Courts from which no appeal could be taken to their own for ultimate decision. Speculative civilians and men of pleasure were alarmed lest the Church should become too powerful, and interfere disagreeably with their pursuits and

amusements. It was all in vain that the Church earnestly disclaimed any intention or desire to invade the province of civil jurisdiction. The boundaries between the two jurisdictions had been so long disregarded or obliterated that men had ceased to be able to distinguish them, and knew not to what extent spiritual claims might be urged. In short, the "two kingdoms" were again at war, and men joined the one or the other, according to their respective principles.

Once more the kindred elements, to which reference has been already made, began to appear. For some time before the conflict began there had been an increase of religious earnestness throughout all Scotland, as will be readily admitted by all who are duly acquainted with the state of the country. But the religious mind of the community did not at once awake to the importance of the Non-intrusion controversy. "Cut an inch deeper and you will find the Emperor!" exclaimed an enthusiastic French soldier, when the surgeon was making an incision in his breast to extract a bullet. The controversy had to cut deeper before it reached the heart of Scotland, and there found its spiritual king. But it did cut deep enough at length. When it became apparent that what Presbyterians of the olden mould understood by the expression "spiritual independence" was in peril, the heart of the community began to throb strongly and warmly, as it had done of yore, and earnest-minded men began to gaze intently on the progress of the conflict. About the same time there arose in many districts of the country a deep and solemn feeling of religious faith and earnestness, such as had not been known for a century, when the events which occurred at Cambuslang and Kilsyth attracted the attention of the kingdom. These revivals of religion, as they were termed, were contemporaneous with the growing interest in the controversy which had begun to be generally felt, but were neither directly connected with it, nor called forth by it, so far as could be observed. They tended, however, to increase and strengthen the power of religious principle throughout the kingdom; and to whatever extent that took place, it produced the same conviction respecting the pre-eminent importance of that great idea which the Church was endeavouring to explain and defend.

Meanwhile, the conflict went on and deepened. The whole character of the principle of spiritual independence, or, the freedom of serving Christ alone in spiritual matters, appeared, as point after point became developed in the struggle. The crisis came. The "two kingdoms" had taken their positions front to front. One only question remained: Would the State recognise the free and independent jurisdiction of the Church in matters spiritual, retaining unimpaired its own jurisdiction in

matters civil and temporal? The answer was prompt and decided, as uttered by the leading British Statesman: "Whatever Church allies itself with the State, that Church must obey the State." The Presbyterian Church, by a majority in its General Assembly, true to its original principles, surrendered at once all its civil emoluments, abandoned its connexion with the State, and having solemnly protested against the invasions which had been made upon its jurisdiction, calmly retired, poor in worldly wealth, but rich in integrity, strong in faith, and free to serve the Lord Jesus Christ alone in all that pertains to His spiritual kingdom. Thus did the Free Church of Scotland, to use the words of an able writer in the *Quarterly Review*, "by a conspicuous act of self-sacrifice, give, for the first time, to Scottish Presbyterianism an European fame."

Our object has been to ascertain as exactly as possible the central principle of Scottish Ecclesiastical Polity, both in its own nature, and as it has adapted itself to the Scottish character, and been generally viewed by the Scottish mind; for thus only can justice be done either to that principle, or to those by whom it has been so long strenuously maintained. And in order to render the point as intelligible as possible to minds not conversant with the technical terms used by ecclesiastical controversialists, we have carefully abstained from the use of these terms. If the view which we have thus attempted to give of the central and characteristic principle of Scottish Presbyterianism, as held by the decided and staunch adherents of that Church, be the right one, it will, we think, be obvious, that when a serious and direct conflict between the two jurisdictions, civil and ecclesiastical, arose, it could not end otherwise than it has done. For it is abundantly evident that secular politicians have never regarded the Presbyterian theory as reconcilable with their own notions of civil jurisdiction.* Nor is it necessary to accuse them of either wilful blindness, or incapacity, on that account. It is not easy, perhaps not possible, for men to change what may be termed the *positive* in their mental position. The politician cannot so cease to think and feel as a politician, as to be able to think and feel absolutely as an ecclesiastic;—even when he tries to do so, he but partially succeeds. He comes relatively nearer to the position of the ecclesiastic, but his positive position is still secular. Exactly similar is the case of the ecclesiastical thinker. When, therefore, the question between them becomes one concerning the essence of their respective positions, or the fine-drawn line which separates their jurisdictions, it is of almost impossible solution. We can conceive that able and honest politicians might think the Scottish idea entirely wrong, or utterly impracticable, as seen from their point of view, and might therefore oppose it zealously

and conscientiously ; but they ought to have been able to perceive, that as it had been held by loyal, truth-loving, and able men in other days, to whom it seemed intelligible, and in whom it wrought as a principle of invincible might, so it might be intelligently and conscientiously held by Scottish Presbyterians in our own day, without exposing them to the charge of imbecility, disingenuousness, or rebellion. Such insinuations have no tendency to convince an opponent ; add no grace or dignity to the man who employs them ; and prevent that calm and dispassionate exercise of judgment which alone becoms a discussion in which matters of great and vital importance are concerned.

The Scottish Ecclesiastical controversy "has taken end," to use a Scottish phrase, but what has become of the Scottish idea of the relation between Church and State itself ? That idea has done great deeds and endured great trials in Scotland, both in former times, and in the present. But is it exhausted ? Has it effloresced and begun to fade away ? Or has it borne fruit, and diffused seed, which may produce a growth over a space greatly more extensive than was ever covered by the parent tree, and yet not less powerful wherever it may spring up ? These are questions which deserve our attention, and to which we must briefly address ourselves,—soliciting the patience and calm thought of our readers.

It seems abundantly evident that in Scotland the power of the ancient Presbyterian idea is not exhausted. When the Disruption took place, and 474 Ministers relinquished their connexion with the State, rather than abandon the principle by which, as they believed, that connexion ought to be regulated, they did not sink into nameless and powerless obscurity, but were hailed by vast numbers, as having vindicated the ancient renown of their native land, and maintained the religious liberty of the Church of their fathers. In an almost incredibly short period of time, Churches, Mansees, and Schools were erected, and funds raised for the maintenance of the Ministry, proving unmistakably that the principle which the Ministers of the Disruption had been striving to realize within the Establishment, and had withdrawn from it that they might preserve, was one which the people of Scotland would not willingly let die. And no sooner had that principle been placed again in a position of security and permanence, than it displayed anew its native character by resuming its native course of action. Directing its attention to the abodes of poverty, ignorance, and immorality, it strove to convey to the degraded and sinking masses of the population, that Gospel of the grace of God, which alone can meet effectually all human ills, both as remedy and as preventive. This, if the Scottish principle be true, is its duty,—even its functional duty.

It cannot complacently co-exist with ignorance, and pauperism, any more than it can with immorality and irreligion. Entertaining strong convictions regarding the imperative duty of advancing the spiritual kingdom of light and holiness, it cannot slumbrously tolerate the rapid growth around it of the kingdom of darkness and depravity. It cannot, therefore, be contented with having a certain number of strong and flourishing congregations; but seeks, by what it terms Home Missionary exertions, to penetrate into the dark and degraded haunts of our dense city population, seeking to reclaim district after district, with the aim and desire of bringing, so far as may be possible, the whole community under the pure, peaceful, and happy sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ. To this task it seems to be addressing itself more and more, as if almost instinctively and by the mere force of its nature. We will venture to add, that unless the Free Church continue to prosecute this task with increasing zeal, it will forfeit one of its strongest claims to be regarded as the legitimate heir to the principles of the Scottish Reformation.

The act of the Disruption, and the existence of the Free Church, have, to cite again the language of the Quarterly Review, "given for the first time to Scottish Presbyterianism an European fame." Whether it be for the first time or not, we need not stay to inquire; but unquestionably the events which have within these few years taken place in Scotland, have made the principles of Scottish Presbyterianism more intelligibly and impressively known to all Christendom than they ever were before. And throughout Europe the Scottish conflict and its results have attracted the attention of Churches and communities which were in a state of mind peculiarly prepared to apprehend at least some portion of the Scottish idea, and to form a tolerable conception of its true character. Philosophical thinkers, such as Guizot, for example, have long been aware of the importance to both civil and religious liberty of a well-recognised and carefully preserved distinction between the two jurisdictions—civil and ecclesiastical. The above named philosophical statesman expressly declares, that he regards the very idea of distinct and separate jurisdictions as one of the most valuable results of the Reformation. For a considerable time that idea has been struggling within the European mind, though darkly and confusedly entertained. Thinking men are becoming more and more convinced that if the same power, whether it be Pope or King, wield both civil and spiritual authority, the result must inevitably be the most absolute despotism. It matters not, whether the form of government be monarchical or democratic, as has been clearly shown in Switzerland, where political

cians holding what in this country would be called principles of extreme radicalism are in power. In their hands the combination of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction is found to be as despotic and oppressive as it could be in those of the most absolute monarch. The conviction has accordingly grown and spread throughout the Continent, that civil liberty cannot be obtained and held in safety without a complete separation between the two jurisdictions. To this men give expression by loud and urgent demands for an entire separation between Church and State—for religious liberty—for freedom of opinion in religious matters—for no endowment to any Church or creed—for equal endowments to every Church and creed—for some one or other of the various forms which the dimly-perceived idea seems to them to assume. There cannot be a doubt that the Scottish Disruption has already tended to give both strength and some degree of distinctness to this conviction and desire. But there is great reason to question whether many on the Continent have yet obtained a right conception of the Scottish idea.

A cognate question, to the following effect, might be fairly raised,—Would the *mere separation* of Church and State achieve what is sought? Might not the State continue to look with jealousy on the proceedings of a large body of men acting regularly in accordance with a systematic plan, and exercising great influence in the community, and at times manifest its jealousy by interfering with those proceedings, notwithstanding their complete separation and self-support? That would be persecution! is the reply. Well, but what is to prevent that? Not the mere fact of separation from the State, and the want of any national endowment. On the other hand, might not a Church, unendowed and wholly separate from the State, but numerically strong and conscious of possessing public influence, be tempted to use that influence in matters purely political, and to the serious embarrassment of the State? That would be an invasion of the civil province! is the reply. Well, but what is to prevent that? Not the mere fact of separation from the State, and the want of any national endowment. The mutual recognition by Church and State of each other's province and jurisdiction, and of their respective supremacy within these provinces, seems to be essential to harmony and peace, even when wholly separated. This principle the Free Church inherited from the Scottish Presbyterianism of the Reformation, has retained not only in spite of, but even in consequence of its separation from the State,—nay, that separation would not probably have taken place but for the clearness and pertinacity with which it cleaved to and acted upon that principle, and seems still to entertain more distinctly than any other Ecclesiastical body in Christendom.

Keeping still our position aloof from the heat and confusion of the recent conflict, we regard the steady adherence of the Free Church to the great primary principle of Presbyterianism, the perfect distinctness and full co-ordination of the respective jurisdictions of the "two kingdoms," civil and spiritual, as fitted to render the existence of that Church a blessing of unspeakable value to Europe and all Christendom. In the midst of the tumultuous agitations with which all Europe is convulsed, it is of the utmost importance that in one country there has been one mighty principle clearly enunciated and nobly realized—so realized, too, as to be at this moment the most active agent in spreading everywhere throughout that country the elements of social enlightenment and renovation—of purity and peace—of loyalty to an earthly monarch and hallowed allegiance to the Divine Redeemer. Such, beyond all controversy, are the effects which this principle has produced and is extending in Scotland. This principle has, it is admitted, acquired "an European fame." It not only, therefore, ought to be, but must and will be, carefully and universally studied, that the lesson which it seems to teach may be duly weighed and rightly understood. And this may surely be done without those who engage in it acquiring any of the asperity which the recent controversy may have excited in the minds of the combatants. None but shallow or unreflecting minds will rest satisfied with the fancy that such an event could have been produced by any principle which was not an embodiment of some great truth; and in the deliberate investigation of strong principles and great truths the littleness of partisanship should have no place.

We frankly admit that our desire to rescue the Scottish Church Controversy from the obscurity of that technical terminology by which its own writers have so much darkened it to the perception of other minds, and to place it in a position in which it might be contemplated apart from the mists of party prejudice, has led us on in the statement of our own mode of viewing it to a length which we did not anticipate, and which renders it now impossible to devote so much space to Dr. Buchanan's work as we intended. This, however, is of the less consequence, as that work will doubtless soon find, if it has not already found, its way into the hands of the greater proportion of our readers.

For a complete and full study of the Scottish Church question, as it has been termed, Dr. Buchanan's elaborate and able work furnishes ample materials. It begins by stating, briefly, but very clearly and distinctly, the leading principles of Scottish Presbyterianism. An outline of Scottish ecclesiastical history is then given, in which the continued presence and operation of these principles are traced, whether as opposed or admitted, over-

borne or triumphant, assailed by the civil power or recognised and sanctioned. This part of the work displays both great accuracy of historical knowledge and remarkable fairness of statement. The rise of a party within the Church of Scotland more favourable to the interference of civil authority in the long disputed province of the admission of ministers to the pastoral office, is clearly and impartially related, though without any attempt to conceal the views of that party which the author himself takes. We are then informed respecting the state of the two parties in the Church a little before and at the time when "The Ten Years' Conflict" commenced; and the characters of the men who then began to stand prominently forward as the leaders in the rising conflict are sketched with much discrimination, vigour, and eloquence. The remainder of the work, amounting to at least three-fourths of the whole, is a detailed summary of the controversy. It is evident that Dr. Buchanan has regarded this as the object which it was his duty to accomplish; and it is equally evident that he has spared no pains in the endeavour fully to achieve it. In this he has been eminently successful. As the history of an important and protracted controversy, we do not know its superior. Extending as it did over ten years, and engaging the whole energies and activities of one large and influential section of the educated Scottish mind, calling forth the *perferendum ingenium Scotorum*, it produced an immense number of speeches and pamphlets from the controversialists on both sides. Dr. Buchanan refers to a collection of 782 pamphlets in his possession while engaged in his arduous task. All these he seems to have carefully ransacked, culling from each the arguments most used and relied on by either party. These arguments he has largely incorporated into his work, so that the reader has the opportunity of perusing the reasonings of the leading men on both sides in their own language. This is done, however, with so much tact, that the work does not thereby acquire the broken and patched character which must have been the case in the hands of a less skilful author. On the other hand, the reader is often gratified with some of those passages of splendid eloquence which the fervent genius of some of the leaders poured forth, like lightning flashing through the tempest.

In a literary point of view the work is one of very high merit. The style is at once easy and dignified—two qualities which are seldom successfully combined. It is also animated and vigorous, rising at times into energy and eloquence. But though the style is generally graceful, easy, dignified, and vigorous, and is well sustained, and equable in the flow of its sentences, we are occasionally startled and surprised by the occurrence of phraseology somewhat out of keeping with the stateliness of the rest.

The work, we have already said, is admirable as the history of a great controversy. Yet, while perusing it, we felt that there were some important elements of such a controversy scarcely mentioned. It was not, surely, nothing more than a controversy between two parties of ministers waged in Church Courts for the sake of ecclesiastical power. If it had, it never could have stirred so deeply the hearts of the Scottish people, nor given rise to the Free Church, with its hundreds of Congregations and myriads of supporters. There must have taken place a movement throughout the community; and that, too, a movement of a religious character, else the result as now seen would have been impossible. Yet scarcely any notice of any such religious movement is taken by Dr. Buchanan; and the reader of his volumes might never know that such was indeed the case, unless he learned it from some other source. There was also, surely, another phase of life and feeling besides the controversial. Not less than 474 ministers left their homes, and cast themselves and their families, in great diversity of circumstances, on the care of Providence and the affections of the people—of very poor and powerless people in many parts of the country. There must have been many tender, many trying scenes throughout Scotland at that period—many privations borne, and much suffering endured, with calm, patient, heroic, martyr-like constancy and firmness. Dr. Buchanan might well have devoted some pages of his work to the sacred duty of recording at least a few of these events, and thereby affording a glimpse into the inner life of the Disruption and its results. This does not, indeed, seem to have come within the scope of his plan. It seems rather to have been his design to write a history of the controversy as a conflict of antagonist principles. In that he has certainly succeeded, having produced a very correct statement of the principles held, and a very perfect digest of the arguments employed, so that any person of sufficient mental power and perspicacity may, from the careful perusal of his work alone, obtain the means of forming for himself an adequately comprehensive and sound view of the whole subject. This is great merit; but the merit of the work would not have been diminished if there had been detailed what the heart of Scotland felt, as well as what its mind thought, throughout and after the conflict which so deeply affected its venerated Church.

With one concluding remark we take our leave of this important and very able work. When any powerful movement has taken place, and produced what may be termed a social or moral revolution in a community, it is of extreme importance to all succeeding generations, in every country, that the real nature of that movement should be understood, and its true history be re-

corded. If this be not done either at the time, or while the events are recent and unforgotten, it may either never be done accurately at all, or though great diligence and labour should produce an accurate record, that record may fail to command the assent of succeeding times, and the lesson may be lost. The attempt to write contemporaneous history is, indeed, peculiarly difficult and perilous, and is liable to be suspected of partiality. Still its appearance at the time when there are living witnesses of what it ventures to record ready and able at once either to refute or to ratify its statements, cannot but impart to it the utmost value as a work which—having stood, if it do stand, the severest scrutiny of the most competent judges—deserves the full confidence of posterity. And if the historian have been himself an actor in the scenes which he describes, and struggles which he relates—thoroughly conversant with all its profoundest and most secret deliberations, most energetic actions, and minutest details,—the value and credibility of his history must be thereby almost incalculably enhanced. Such is exactly the position of Dr. Buchanan and his work. The work appears when there are thousands whose own knowledge enables them to test its accuracy and completeness. And the author himself is one who very early occupied, and throughout retained, a prominent position in the councils and deeds of the 'Ten Years' Conflict, of which he has become the historian. A work produced at such a time, and by one so amply qualified, cannot fail to go down to future ages as a full and authentic record of the recent remarkable controversy, bearing the stamp of the high moral courage which braved the severest possible test, and the moral veracity in which that test found no flaw. Even then, the principles of the controversy will have to be estimated by their own intrinsic value and truth; but they who may sit in the seat of judgment will have before them a clear and able statement, supported by ample evidence.

ART. VI.—1. *First Report from the Select Committee on the Slave Trade.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 18th April 1848.

2. *Second do. do.* 30th May 1848.

3. *Third do. do.* 25th July 1848.

4. *Fourth do. do.* 10th August 1848.

5. *First Report from the Select Committee on the Slave Trade.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 24th May 1849.

6. *Second do. do.* 21st June 1849.

FOR thirty years this country has been attempting, at an annual average cost of about half a million sterling, to put an end to the crime and the cruelties of the slave trade. The policy pursued by us for this purpose has been one of armed prevention. We shall not here comment either upon the expense or danger attendant upon the prosecution of such a system. Its costliness, both in regard to life and treasure, is obvious, and very little consideration is required to shew that its operation is attended with peculiar difficulties. The right of search which it involves is very liable to be abused; and even when exercised with the greatest justice and delicacy, is so disagreeable to the party subjected to it that it can hardly fail to excite in his bosom feelings of jealousy and dislike against his inquisitor. Many instances have occurred in the history of our preventive measures in illustration of this fact; and had it not been for the conciliatory tone and conceding spirit which our Government has manifested toward the Cabinets of Paris, Madrid, and Lisbon, there is but too good reason to believe that petty quarrels arising out of the right of search, to which we have just referred, would long ere this have magnified themselves into national disputes.

Yet although the expense and hazard consequent upon our present system are very serious drawbacks, they do not appear entitled to much weight when urged as reasons for its abolition. The cause in behalf of which they are incurred is of so benevolent and sacred a character, that arguments of expense or expediency seem, at its very mention, to sink into utter insignificance. Some measures there may be whose continuance depends upon grounds of economy not less than upon those of suitability or success. But to this class the measure now under review cannot belong. To justify its abandonment it is not enough to shew that it is costly; we must further prove that it is defective—and defective, not simply because it does not accomplish *all* that was anticipated from it, but because it is, from its nature, *actually unsuited to cope* with the evil which it is intended to remove.

To determine whether such a verdict as this can be brought against our present policy, we must, on the one hand, examine the disease, *i.e.*, the slave trade, and on the other, its remedy, *i.e.*, our system of prevention; and from this comparison judge whether the effects of the one are fitted to remove, or, at least, to counteract the causes of the other. In this paper we do not intend to give any digest of the evidence contained in the documents hereto prefixed. This would occupy a larger space than we can at present afford, and, in point of fact, would not materially assist us in our present inquiry. It may, however, be proper to state, that a careful perusal of those Reports leads us to the conclusion that our coercive measures have not merely failed to check the supply of slaves to Brazil, but that, on the other hand, they have had the effect of greatly aggravating the horrors of the middle passage, and the sufferings endured by the negroes on the Barracoons on the coast of Africa, as well as of very materially prejudicing the interests of British merchants trading to that country. We do not, however, here intend to enter upon an examination of either of these two last points, or adduce any evidence in their support. Our object will be gained if we succeed in shewing that the failure, in point of fact, of our coercive policy to check the transportation of slaves to Brazil, results from its unsoundness in point of principle.

The slave trade, like any other mercantile speculation, is the result of certain causes which create and continue the investment of a certain amount of capital in a particular branch of traffic. It has not arisen fortuitously, much less in opposition to the interests of its promoters; nor will it continue in existence one moment longer than these interests are secured. What, then, are the causes which have led to an investment of capital in such a speculation as this? Are they the cruelties of the trade, or are they its gains? the miseries thereby inflicted on the slave, or the wealth therefrom accruing to the slaver? The answer is obvious: Mercantile speculations, of whatever kind, are invariably governed by the laws of self-interest. Gain is the mainspring of them all; and however much circumstances may induce a preference of one trade over another, still it is true that the ruling motive which induces a choice at all is the expectation of profit. The slave trade forms no exception to this rule; nor are its speculations, how unholy soever they may be, governed by any other laws than those which regulate the most lawful enterprises of the Christian merchant. Keeping, then, distinctly in view that this traffic results from the same causes as those which prompt the most honest trades, it necessarily follows that those circumstances which act as a stimulus upon the one tend to produce a similar effect upon the other, and that no means

which, from their nature, are inadapated effectually to repress the latter can be the proper means to use, in order to destroy the former.

To interrupt and finally overcome slavery, *i.e.*, the importation of African slaves into Brazil, we, along with that State, and those of France, Spain, Portugal, and America, have entered into a league of armed prevention. The force employed consists of a fleet of cruisers stationed off the coast of Africa, whence the slaves are to be shipped, thousands of miles removed from that of Brazil, where they are to be landed. The right of search belonging to this squadron is necessarily limited, since it embraces within its range those vessels only which belong to one or other of the Powers composing the League. Nay, this limited mutual jurisdiction is still farther circumscribed, since, from its cognizance we must except America, which does not permit her vessels to be searched by any other than her own cruisers.

The supply or forced importation of slaves into Brazil arises from a demand there existing for their labour. From the nature of its soil and climate, that country is peculiarly suited for growing certain tropical plants, as sugar, coffee, &c. From certain causes, to which we shall afterwards allude, the Brazilian planter has found that it is more advantageous, *i.e.*, more profitable, for him to invest money in the purchase of a slave, whom he can compel to work, than pay for the industry of hired servants. Now, as profit is the very thing at which he is aiming, it is clear, that so long as slave labour is to the Brazilian planter cheaper than free labour, so long will he—*cæteris paribus*—continue to prefer, and strive to obtain the former. Slave labour may become dearer, and therefore less profitable than free labour, from one or other of two causes—either from free labour becoming to the Brazilian planter cheaper, and therefore more profitable than slave labour, or from slave labour becoming, from a decrease in its supply, so much scarcer, dearer, and therefore less profitable than it at present is, that independently of any thing intrinsic in itself, it may become, from that cause alone, *viz.*, a decreased supply, more expensive, and therefore less profitable than free labour. The accomplishment of the latter object is what our present policy aims at; and we admit, that if it were able to realize this object it would effectually prevent the further importation of slaves into Brazil. The demand for these in Brazil results from their value to the planter: remove that value, no matter by what means, and you necessarily remove along with it that demand. This effect, however, so far as we have any means of judging, either from experience or analogy, our preventive policy cannot achieve. Experience, so far as we possess it, goes to prove this; for in spite of our most powerful

and ably sustained efforts, we find that these have not so affected the supply of slaves as to increase their cost, and so decrease their value to the planter. On the contrary, this supply has lately increased inversely to the activity of our efforts to check it, and become most abundant and cheapest at the very time when we have been putting forth our greatest efforts to render it least abundant and most expensive.

The data we now possess are not sufficiently accurate to enable us to determine the *precise* number of negroes who are annually torn away from Africa to supply the demand for them in the New World. When the trade was a legal one this was a calculation which might have been made with tolerable certainty; but now, in consequence of the contraband nature of the traffic, concealment as to the number of the slaves whom he imports is the natural policy of the trader. Still, upon the question of numbers, we have the evidence of one who, from long residence in Brazil, and intimate acquaintance with the slave trade, must be as well acquainted with the subject as any man could be. Some may be inclined, certainly, to look with distrust upon the statements of an individual who once prosecuted the traffic. For ourselves, we cannot very clearly see the force of this objection, nor understand why his former profession (for he has since abandoned it) should cast suspicion upon the evidence he now gives regarding the present *statistics* of slavery. Be this however as it may, there exists, we think, in the fact of the price of negroes in Brazil a very sufficient proof that in the present case, at all events, these suspicions are groundless. On being asked,—“Are you aware of what number of slaves might have been landed in Brazil from the coast of Africa in 1847?” Dr. Cliffe says,—“Taking it from November 1846 to November 1847, we estimate the quantity at not less than 60,000, and not exceeding, perhaps, 65,000 landed alive.” Being further asked,—“Are you at all aware of what number of slaves might have been taken from the coast of Africa for the purpose of landing 65,000 men in Brazil?” Dr. Cliffe replies,—“The only means of calculation is from the captains, or those employed in it, stating that they receive on board their different vessels a certain amount of men. To produce that number, with what are taken by English cruisers, and what die in various ways, not less than 100,000 would leave the coast of Africa, to produce that amount of living subjects in Brazil at the present time.” And this witness further states that this “was rather a general calculation; it could not be entirely accurate by any means: but he thinks that the number was rather under-stated than over-stated.”*

* Hutt's Committee, 2d Report, 1848—Questions 4099 and 4100.

If this estimate be correct, it leads us to this conclusion, that our coercive measures have not prevented the growth of the Slave Trade. While it was yet a legal traffic, Mr. Pitt, in 1794, computed that 80,000 negroes were annually torn from Africa; and twenty-five years later, viz., in 1820, the African Society gave the number at 70,000. The correctness of these calculations has never been called in question. From 1810 down to the present time, our preventive measures have been in active operation; and yet we find, upon the evidence of one whose opportunities of acquiring knowledge upon the subject are peculiarly favourable, that, in spite of these exertions, the annual number of slaves now torn from Africa has increased one-fifth; and this increase,* be it remarked, is that in a particular over a general demand. In other words, while, in the year 1794, when there existed no obstruction to the traffic, the whole demand for African slaves throughout the markets of the world was adequately met by an annual abstraction of negroes from that country to the extent of 80,000; in the year 1847, when the greatest naval powers are actively employing the most powerful of all obstructions (as they think) to its prosecution, the demand for slaves in the market of Brazil alone requires, in order to meet it, a yearly drainage from Africa of 100,000 negroes. Doubtless it will be said, that the wealth and resources of Brazil have, during this period, increased, and consequently demanded a corresponding increase in the amount of slave labour. This we willingly admit: but if, by the phrase, "corresponding increase," our opponents mean to assert that the gradually increasing demand for slave labour which, in Brazil, has been going steadily on for the last fifty years, is now as adequately met at the close of this half century as it was at its commencement, they just admit—what we desire to shew—that our exertions which, for the last thirty years, have been made for the purpose of destroying this adequacy of supply, have been completely inoperative. But if, on the other hand, they say,—while we admit that the demand for slave labour in Brazil has for many years been increasing, and that the supply has also, during the same period, increased, we totally deny that it has increased at the same proportion, or that the demand is now so adequately met as it was before; they assert that which, could they prove it true, *might* afford a warrant for the continuance of our preventive policy. We say *might*, because even this would not necessarily be sufficient; for such an explanation as the preceding admittedly limits the beneficial effect produced to so very small an amount, that when there is taken into consideration the cost at which this is effected,—the cost not simply of English treasure and English life, but the far more grievous and appalling

cost of negro suffering,—the prudent philanthropist might well doubt whether the application of such a cure were not rather adding to than diminishing the amount of human misery.

But, in truth, this latter position cannot be maintained consistently with facts; for, if it be true that the demand for slaves in Brazil is not so adequately met, since the introduction of our coercive measures, as before that event, it would necessarily follow, upon the principles of supply and demand, that the price of negroes there would be greater now than then; but, instead of this being the case, we find that it is rather the reverse. In 1790, when slaves were transported to Brazil without let or hindrance, their average price there was forty moidores a-head, equal to £54 sterling. In 1847, when for thirty years we have been attempting to put down the trade, their average price is 450 dollars to 400 dollars, equal to from £50 to £45. If the principles of political economy are to be relied upon, the prices now quoted prove that the supply of slaves to Brazil, in 1847, is even ampler than it was in 1790, and they, moreover, corroborate the correctness of Dr. Cliffe's calculations above mentioned.

Facts, therefore, teach that our slave trade policy has not been an effective one; philosophy, if we inquire of her, teaches that, under existing circumstances, it cannot be so. To protect certain home manufactures from foreign competition, *i.e.*, *pro tanto* of our demand for said article, to destroy the foreign manufacture of it, we pursue a system in principle similar to that adopted for the prevention of slavery, but in its operation much more efficient. Our Custom-house policy had, for one of its objects, the *pro tanto* extinction of a trade which is far less remunerative to those venturing to pursue it than is that in slaves; while, in the former, the successful speculator may make 20, 30, or even 40 per cent. on his outlay, in the latter he may, and often does, make not less than 200 per cent. Hence it is evident that, as the inducements to slavery are much greater than those to smuggling, much more efficient means must, to ensure success, be used in the one case than in the other—this increased efficiency being proportioned to the increased inducement. Now, granting, for a moment, that our measures to protect certain home manufactures were completely successful, and completely destroyed *pro tanto* our demand for it, the foreign manufacture of the prohibited article, it is clear, from what has just been stated, that any such success as the one policy cannot establish the certainty or even possibility of success in the other, unless it be shewn that the means employed in the latter are by so much more efficient than in the former, by how much the inducements to engage in the one trade, arising from its superior gains, are greater than in the other.

At home, our revenue-officers have an unlimited right to search every vessel which approaches our shores, for the purpose of ascertaining what cargo she brings, that they may levy from her owners that amount of duty which corresponds to the kind and quantity of her imports. Nor does it require much study to perceive, that if, by hoisting a particular flag, the vessel could evade inspection, and land the cargo duty-free, no such protection as that contemplated by our present system of Custom-house police would long be afforded to British goods competing in the market with those of foreign manufacture.

Besides this unlimited right of jurisdiction which it possesses, our preventive force at home acts from the most commanding position, and in the most effective manner. Instead of being employed in some distant country, there attempting, by sundry devices, to cast impediments in the merchant's way against the manufacture of the prohibited commodity, it interferes not with his plans at this state of their progress; it allows him to manufacture what and how much he pleases, to freight a vessel, to embark his cargo, to consign his goods; and then, after time, trouble, and expense have all been contributed, and the speculator has staked labour and capital, as well in preparing the commodity for market as in bringing it thither, our revenue force takes its stand at the entrance of that harbour, and demands from its owner, e'er it gain admittance there, the payment of that sum which equalizes—possibly increases—the rate at which he can sell it in England, with or beyond that at which it can elsewhere be profitably manufactured.

With regard to our slave trade policy, the case is entirely reversed. Instead of stationing our cruisers off Brazil and Cuba, which is the destination of the slaver, and there attempting to prevent the landing of his cargo, we place them thousands of miles removed from either of these places, along the west coast of Africa, from the Senegal to Benguela, there attempting to prevent the embarkation of his cargo. But, in so stationing our cruisers, are we not attacking the slaver at a point the least disadvantageous for him—at one where he is best able to escape or resist—or where, if captured he should be, he is subject to the least possible loss and vexation? When his vessel has just been armed and stored for the voyage, for which, being well acquainted with its nature, he has made ample preparation, when his crew are newly aboard, and still uninfected by disease, and when animated by the assurance, that if, at this favourable period for him, he but conduct his vessel, whether by stratagem or force, beyond the line of cruisers which hover round his coast, his after-voyage will be performed in safety, and without molestation, the slaver passes his trial for escape at the very

point where, of all others, he would prefer doing so. His fate is thus soon decided; and, instead of crossing the wide Atlantic ere he be assured what it is to be, he is either immediately captured, or at once certified of his safety. In the former case, he has at least been spared delay, anxiety, and labour, all of which enter as very important elements into his calculations; and in the latter, he has secured his object at the very outset of his voyage.

To the jurisdiction possessed by our African cruisers we have already alluded and seen how extremely limited it is. Hence we find that two most important and, to the efficient working of our Revenue Police, essential elements, are entirely wanting to our Preventive Squadron. And when we remark that even the former system, possessed as it is of an unlimited right of search, and acting as it does from the most commanding situation, is still unable to achieve the end it has in view, viz., to prevent the introduction of smuggled goods into this country, can we doubt much whether the latter system, as now pursued, be able to attain its object, when we consider, that with far inferior means of prevention, and these means less efficiently employed, it aims at the destruction of a trade the gains of which are nearly ten times greater, and, as a consequence, the inducements to its prosecution about ten times more powerful?

Some, we believe, there are, who while unable to gainsay these arguments, are yet unwilling to admit the conclusion to which they lead. For although forced, with sadness, to confess that our efforts have as yet failed to achieve the deliverance of Africa, they still look with expectation to the future; or if it even fail to inspire them with confidence, they then fall back upon the other alternative of the dilemma, and advocate the continuance of our Squadron on the ground that if it were withdrawn the prospects of Africa, which are even now gloomy, would then become completely hopeless. Yet what are these but the mere imaginings of the philanthropist? What except the wish that they were true, gives any reason to conclude that they are so? If the benevolence of plans could ensure their feasibility, then might these dreams become realities. But Nature will not alter the course of her operations even at the entreaties of Mercy. She has ordained, that to reverse an evil you must destroy its cause, and any attempt to remove or alter this decree is utterly hopeless. The cause of slavery is its gains, and so long as that cause exists, so long will that accursed traffic. It matters not what means are employed, what expense incurred, or what amount of life expended, all will be useless, unless the remedy applied to destroy Slavery be calculated to destroy its profits. But if it be true, in point of fact, that our cruisers have

not so reduced the supply of Negroes to Brazil as to make their labour scarcer and dearer, and therefore less profitable than that of free labourers, and further, if it be true, as by the preceding argument we have attempted to prove it is, that our coercive measures *cannot* produce that result, then it necessarily follows that our present policy, however long pursued, cannot destroy the Slave Trade.

To many this seems so sad a conclusion that they cannot believe it true. This, however, we need not remark, is no evidence, or even presumption, that it is not so. Yet this sadness—whence does it result? Is it from the conviction that we have not destroyed, and cannot destroy, the Slave Trade, by casting artificial impediments in the way of its prosecution? If so, what is this but repining against the laws of Nature, and lamenting that they do not affect the Slave Trade in a different manner from that in which they affect every other. Experience teaches us that any restraint upon the supply of tobacco has the effect of raising its price, and instead of lessening directly tends to create additional inducements to meet the demand for it. And if (setting the questions of revenue and protection aside) we wished to destroy the smuggling of tobacco, whether would we, for this purpose, increase our Custom-house police or remove our Custom-house duties? Now, if the contraband trade in Slaves be pursued for the same end as the contraband trade in tobacco, viz., for that of gain, why should we be either surprised or sorry that it is governed by the same laws? And why, since there exists no reason for our tolerating the smuggling of Slaves as there does for our tolerating the smuggling of tobacco, do we employ toward the suppression of the contraband trade in the former means which cannot destroy the contraband trade in the latter?

To this it is immediately answered, Would you then withdraw all those hindrances which at present lie in the Slaver's way to the prosecution of his accursed traffic, and stake the future happiness and freedom of Africa upon the result of so unequal a contest as that of Free and Slave labour? To this double question we reply, *first*, If those facts, viz., the present prices and number of Slaves imported into Brazil be correct, and if our analogical argument be sound, then the present so called hindrances to the Slave Trade are no hindrances at all, and their withdrawal cannot render the condition of Africa worse than it is; and, *secondly*, If such be the case, then the future happiness and freedom of Africa does, in reality, at the present hour, when our cruisers are stationed off its coast, as much depend upon the result of this contest between Free and Slave labour as it would were these cruisers removed.

Those who hold the doctrine that slave labour is cheaper than

free labour will not of course be willing to admit this inference. We shall not here anticipate our views upon this subject, but shall only observe that if that doctrine *be* correct, the prospects of Africa seem to us almost hopeless. For even granting that our coercive measures did to some extent alleviate the woes of that unhappy country, we should look with but little confidence to the continuance of that blessing, and with none to Africa's ultimate freedom, did the attainment of these objects depend upon the capricious and short-lived motives of human benevolence. To secure these ends of mercy there must, we think, be more powerful and constantly operating agents at work than those whose efficiency or failure depends upon the politics of an administration or the revenue of an empire. We are sanguine enough to believe that the salvation of Africa depends upon no such contingencies; but that, like other evils, the slave trade will work its own cure, because those very motives which at present lead to its prosecution are calculated eventually to ensure its abandonment.

Since the Slave Trade to South America is at present carried on because Brazilian planters find it more profitable to employ slave labour than free labour, and since we have failed by means of force to reverse the relative value of these two species of industry, the whole question now depends upon the point whether the gradual operation of events themselves be able to secure this result, or, in other words, whether the labour of slaves or that of hired labourers is essentially the most valuable. In entering upon the examination of this problem, we must be careful not to limit the question to any one particular country. We have already fully and frankly admitted, that, so far as Brazil is concerned, slave labour is cheaper there, at present, than free labour. The demand for the former over the latter incontestably proves this. But when we speak of the inherent cheapness of any article of commerce, we speak of that cheapness not as determined by the effectual demand for it in one portion of a market, to which it may, for certain temporary causes, be exclusively confined, but we look at the article as a means of creating or circulating wealth throughout the whole market, and therefrom decide upon its value by comparing the aggregate or final supply of that article in the market with the effectual demand which there exists for it. In the same way, when we speak of the value of slave labour, we refer not to the value put upon it in Brazil, Cuba, or any other particular country, to which, for certain reasons, it is at present confined, but we look at slave labour as a means of creating and circulating wealth throughout all countries, and decide upon its value by comparing what the aggregate or final demand for such labour in this extended market of the

world would be as compared with its supply. Now, though this may seem the plain and correct method of procedure, it has not been adopted by those who maintain the doctrine that slave labour is cheaper than free labour. They, on the contrary, have not merely confined their investigations to particular markets, and from a special result inferred a general principle, but they have left altogether out of sight the interests of one of the parties, viz., the original seller in Africa, and have regarded those only of the purchaser in Brazil. They first assert that because in certain markets, as Brazil and Cuba, slave labour is cheaper than free labour, therefore it is inherently cheaper, and next imply in this reasoning that because the Brazilian planter is *now* able to purchase slave labour at a lower rate than free labour, he will *always* be able to do so; or, in other words, that the seller, *i.e.*, the African prince, will ever continue willing or able to dispose of slave labour at the present low rate. This conclusion, however, is altogether incorrect, and the implication involved in it totally inadmissible.

The slaves which the Brazilian merchant purchases from the trader to cultivate his farm consist of captives taken in war. The humane device of civilized nations, whereby prisoners are exchanged or ransomed, has no existence in Western Africa. On account of the barbarism of the population and the fertility of the soil, the wants of the African are few and easily supplied. Arts and agriculture are almost wholly unknown; and that proportion of the inhabitants which in other countries is required to supply these branches of industry, is in Africa completely useless. Idleness, the accompaniment of barbarism, begets feuds between neighbouring princes, which lead to frequent and sanguinary wars. In the battles which are fought, one of the contending parties is usually completely routed, from whom, during their flight, the captors take many prisoners, besides those who may be left wounded on the field. These captives, as we have seen, are quite useless to their own tribe, and for similar reasons it will be obvious that they are equally so to their conquerors. Accordingly, we find that prior to the year 1442, the use to which these captives were put was that of sacrifice. About that period, however, the Portuguese commenced to purchase these prisoners, and employ them as slaves; and from that day, those wars which were formerly undertaken from motives of revenge or superstition, began to be systematically pursued for the sake of gain. The price at which these prisoners are originally sold, as compared with that at which they are eventually bought, shews clearly that the seller is really ignorant of the actual value of his captive. For thirty or forty dollars, the African Prince disposes of the slave, who, as a cultivator of the soil,

readily fetches twenty days thereafter, three or four hundred dollars. And here let it be remarked, that to whatever cause this extraordinary rise in the value of the negro might be attributed, it certainly cannot be to the process or treatment he undergoes during this interval. Transported to Brazil, and there purchased for the very purpose of cultivating the ground, his value as a labourer, if experience and common sense are at all to be relied upon, cannot possibly be increased by his voyage across the Atlantic. On the contrary, evidence clear and incontestable proves, that from the first hour of that traffic, down to the present, the very reverse has been all along the case; and that, of whatever value as a labourer the negro might be ere yet he quitted his own country, that value is greatly diminished by the time he is landed in Brazil. Need we suggest the reason of this, or observe, that by the laws of nature, the negro is a more productive, and therefore more valuable labourer while yet possessed of health and vigour, than after he is reduced by suffering and disease, to a state of existence only one step removed from death. And yet this strange increase of value must have a cause. If it result not from the intrinsic worth of the slave having been increased, so that he has actually become a more productive labourer, it must arise from a capability on the part of his employer in Brazil to obtain from his labour, less valuable though it may be, a more profitable return than can the African Prince. That the latter alternative must be as we have now stated it is certain, if our former alternative be correct. The slave must be more valuable to the Planter than to the Prince, either because from the date of his sale the slave's intrinsic value has increased, or because, having not done so, but, on the contrary, deteriorated, the actual productiveness of the slave in Brazil, lessened though it be from what it was in Africa, is yet capable of being turned to better account in the former country than in the latter. But having just shewn that the intrinsic productiveness of the slave is, and must be, greater in Africa than Brazil, it follows that the reason why, in spite of this, he is actually more valuable to the Planter than to the Prince, does not arise from any causes connected with the slave's capacity to perform work, but with the master's ability to supply him with work. This is precisely the situation in which matters stand. The Planter in Brazil has lands and farms to be cultivated; the Prince in Africa has none; so that it is no more surprising that the former should find even less productive labourers more valuable to him, than it is that to the latter the most productive labourers should be comparatively valueless. This view of the relative position in which the African Chief and Brazilian capitalist stand to each other, will afford, we think, to every sincere

inquirer, not merely a satisfactory reason why so great a discrepancy should exist in the price of a slave on different sides of the Atlantic, but likewise a satisfactory reason why slavery itself should be carried on between Africa and Brazil.

Now the generalized doctrine of our opponents regarding the superior cheapness of slave labour, besides being deduced from two isolated, and in all respects peculiar cases, and therefore illogically, *i.e.*, not all established, lies open either to the fatal objection of a *petitio principii*, or is suicidal of their own declared opinions. Because it is evident, that in this doctrine of labour, our opponents either take for granted the fact, that the relative position of labour in Brazil and Africa, in regard to the demand or supply of slaves, will always remain as it is now; or that, supposing this position to be altered, and the African Prince to be one day able to realize from his captives more than he now does, or even as much as the Brazilian Planter, the former will still continue to dispose of that captive at his present price. Now, we not only reject the first admission as illogical, but we deny its truth. As we have already seen that the present value of the slave in Brazil over his value in Africa entirely results from the amount of work existing for him in the former over the latter country, and not from his abstract superior productiveness, it follows, that just as more work is created for him in Africa, his value there will increase, and in Brazil proportionally diminish. So that to assert or imply, that because slave labour is now an hundred-fold more valuable in Brazil than in Africa, therefore it will always remain so; is just to say, that the latter country is an hundred-fold less productive than the former. But such a proposition is obviously incorrect. The very same evidence that, *viz.*, of merchants and travellers, upon which our belief in the natural riches and fertility of Brazil rests, goes equally to prove that the natural riches and fertility of Africa is little, if at all inferior. Its productions are rich and varied, embracing most of the fruits and minerals of the South American kingdom, beside many which are there unknown, as various kinds of drugs and dyes, and iron ore in very great abundance. And if such be the native wealth of a country as yet little explored, and hardly at all cultivated, is it unreasonable to conclude, that when labour has been more extensively and intelligently applied, the soil of Africa will be found still more productive than is at present supposed? Hence our opponents' assumption seems erroneous. There is no reason whatever to imagine that the position of Cuba, or Brazil, and Africa will always continue the same; but, on the contrary, not merely a likelihood, but a moral certainty, that the demand for labour in Africa will some day greatly increase; that the value of the negro there as a cultivator of the

soil—at present unappreciated—will become so great, that instead of costing in Brazil, as he does at the present day, only 300 dollars, his employers in Africa would not part with him for double that sum. If our opponents maintain that he would, they advance a doctrine at once contrary to reason and suicidal of their own. They have over and again admitted that gain is the originating cause of slavery; that it is the thirty dollars which he now receives that induces the African Prince to sell his captive; and how can our opponents be ought else than inconsistent with themselves if, to establish their theory respecting the value of slave labour, they either maintain or imply that even should the captive become worth 600 dollars, the African Prince will still continue to part with him for thirty?

Nor let it be supposed, that when the value of the negro has been so enhanced, slavery to Brazil will have ceased only because its pecuniary inducement shall have died away. Another and, if possible, a stronger element will then have come into operation, by whose influence the negro will not only be saved from bondage in Brazil, but also from bondage in Africa. Let but the seeds of native industry take root in that country, let but the cultivation of its soil and the manufacture of its productions, whether for home or foreign trade, begin to spread abroad their roots through African society, and bind together by the ties of interest and dependence the various ranks and members of its population, and *intelligence*, that noble fruit of such a system, will create in every bosom those principles of self-respect and moral courage which will form barriers against injustice and oppression too strong even for avarice itself to demolish. But, in truth, they will never be so assailed; for avarice will by that time have discovered purer and more abundant streams at which to slake its thirst for gain than those of trafficking in human blood—those, namely, of trafficking in human labour. Such has been the experience of the world's history hitherto, nor can we see upon what principle of reasoning our opponents can predict an exception to such a result in the case of Africa. Yet some there are who have so foretold. For instance, Mr. McCulloch says—“It would appear that some modification of slavery, or a supply of compulsory labour of some sort or other, is necessary to enable civilized man to occupy and turn to a useful account some of the most fertile and extensive regions of the earth.”* In this short sentence, the continuance of slavery is indirectly predicted, if not even justified, on the ground of expediency. If a system of compulsory labour be not applied to African negroes, “some

* McCulloch's Com. Dict., New Edition, 1846, p. 1142.

of the most fertile and extensive regions" will be left uncultivated, and we are left to conclude that as the latter would be a more disastrous calamity than the former, slavery will never cease. This argument, which displays what amount of faith the reasoner possesses in the beneficence of the Deity, paves the way for a still more startling assertion. "It is to no purpose to say that free labour is cheaper than slave labour. We more than doubt whether, when applied to slaves, there can be any foundation to such a statement; but that is really immaterial, the fact being that were slavery abolished, few or no free labourers would be found to engage in the great departments of industry carried on in the slave-holding countries. It would be a contradiction and absurdity to suppose it otherwise."* In this very sweeping averment, beside the violence which is done to the opinions of those who have always considered that the comparative cheapness of free and slave labour did affect, and that very materially, the question of slavery, we are told in so many words that African negroes are not men at all, but mere brutes. The doctrine of the cheapness of labour *may*, it is admitted, affect the problem of slavery if applied to Europeans, though even this is doubtful, but to extend it to the case of slaves (by which, we presume, Mr. M'Culloch means African negroes) is totally absurd. Now, this is not merely to assert that the motives which prompt the European to labour are more powerful than those which actuate the negro, but unqualifiedly to declare that the latter are totally devoid of any such motives. In such a conclusion few, we think, can agree. It is sufficiently disproved by the case of our cruisers off Africa, and of several of our West Indian Colonies. Kroom-men, or native Africans, are employed for hire in both these departments of our service, and instead of being lazy or useless servants, are found in these warm climates much more efficient sailors and workmen than Europeans, being capable of sustaining a much greater amount of fatigue. We admit that there may exist some disparity of moral energy between the Caucasian and African tribes; that, on the whole, the latter may, either from accidental or permanent causes, be of a more sluggish temperament, and less inclined to physical or mental exertion. But while we grant this, and, for argument's sake, to its very fullest extent, we still affirm that such a conclusion does not disprove the correctness of our principle, that free labour is cheaper than slave labour, unless it is said—which, besides taking the whole question for granted, is plainly absurd—that Africans *must* always be slaves just because of this disparity. Whether

* M'Culloch's Com. Dict., New Edition, 1846, p. 1144.

we look at Africa, Brazil, or Lapland, the same great truth holds good, that the moral and physical organization of the world's inhabitants are everywhere adapted to the region they inhabit. And it is quite as false in principle to conclude, that because African negroes are naturally less energetic than Europeans, therefore they are entirely disqualified from voluntary exertion, as it would be at variance with fact to say, that because the Laplander is less enterprising than the Englishman, therefore he is not enterprising at all. This inferiority on the part of the Laplander does not render him a slave; and why should it be sufficient to render the African?

To bring our reasonings to a point. Having proved from experience that the negro must be a more productive labourer before he undergoes the middle passage than after it, *i.e.*, in Africa than in Brazil, we have shewn that he is more valuable in the latter country than in the former, only because capitalists in Brazil are better able to turn his industry to account. But having further explained that this does not arise from Africa being a poorer country, but simply from capitalists there being as yet ignorant of that natural wealth which their country does really possess; we have, reasoning from the experience of the past, and upon the admitted selfishness and avarice of man, concluded that this state of matters will not always continue, but that, on the contrary, the African Prince must come some day to appreciate the real value of his captive, which, as it is greater in Africa than in Brazil to the extent that the negro is a more productive labourer before the middle passage, than after it, will prevent his being disposed of to the trader except on terms too extravagant to be complied with; that being thus, for the sake of greater gain accruing to his master, retained in Africa, and employed in cultivating the soil and manufacturing its productions, intelligence and information, which are consequent upon these pursuits, will gradually spread themselves abroad throughout the mass of the labouring community; so that if trade and commerce, in their more extensive and complicated departments, presuppose not free industry instead of forced labour to their prosecution, a sense of their importance, and of the absolute dependence under which their employer lies for their labour, will urge that community to demand and enable them to secure their independence. And thus in *either* case the free labour will ultimately be found cheaper, *i.e.*, more productive, than slave labour, because by means of the former more extensive transactions will be gone into, and as a consequence of this greater gains be realized.

It is upon principles such as these—the most natural and powerful of any which direct and accelerate the progress of civi-

lisation—that the doctrine of slave labour meets with its fullest refutation. The desire of gain—that powerful motive which has developed the natural resources of Europe and America—has done so through free labour as the most powerful element which for this purpose it could employ. African slavery results from causes which are at variance with the economy of nature; and as surely as that economy must gain the ascendant, and finally pervade every department of Nature's kingdom, slavery must cease. But this event can never be hastened by opposing the movements of that process—long and tedious it may be—by which the intrinsic value of the negro as a labourer in Africa ceases to be appreciated. Fleets which check the supply of slave labour to Brazil can never create the demand for the negro's labour on the soil of Africa. This must be done ere slavery be vanquished. It is a battle which must be fought, not on the Atlantic, but on the soil of Western Africa, and one which must be gained, not by the weapons of modern warfare, however effective these may be as agents of destruction, but by the combination of those elements of human skill and natural productiveness which the Almighty has scattered throughout every province which is blest with fertility and subject to the dominion of man. Africa possesses these elements within herself, and only waits their further development. That development may and will be assisted by every encouragement which is given to the application of African industry to the cultivation of the African soil. And while our cruisers, used as a Maritime Police to prevent the crime of slavery, must ever fail in that object, these same cruisers, used as a Protective Squadron to our merchants trading with the cultivators of African produce, may become an efficient means to destroy the trade in slaves, by fostering the energies of free industry, and developing more rapidly in Africa that demand for her children's labour which is alone able to overcome the present demand for, and consequent supply of, her children's lives.

Our philosophy may be wrong, but unless it is so our conclusions must be right. To say the least of it, there is a strong presumption that they are. For what else can we think of our remedy for the Slave Trade, but that it is useless, if not pernicious, when after an application of it for more than thirty years, we find that trade as extensively pursued, and only differing from what it was, by being still bloodier and more revolting in its character? And whither can we look for a cure to a disease so inveterate if not to the reacting influences of those exciting causes which have led to its prosecution, and which baffle human ingenuity to destroy? These questions, which we have now briefly attempted to answer, demand the serious consideration of

every well-wisher to the cause of humanity, and of all who feel as they ought the responsibility which attaches to England in pursuing so bold and hazardous a policy as now she does. It cannot be too forcibly impressed upon us that as plans, however benevolent, cannot be carried on in opposition to the laws of nature, so the philanthropy of our Slave Trade measures ought never to be urged as an excuse, and still less as a reason, for their imprudence. To benefit our fellow-men we must often sacrifice the motives of humanity at the shrine of reason. *Feeling* may give an aim to our benevolence, but it is *thinking* alone that can guide us to its attainment. Let us beware that in our practice we substitute not the end for the means, or fail accurately to distinguish the exact province of both. This is an error into which the humane are apt to fall, but it is one which, however unwittingly committed, is followed by consequences as lamentable as those which result from the most deliberate blunder.

Two Select Committees—one appointed last year and one during the present session—have presented us in all with six Reports. The leading conclusion of the last of these Reports, recently laid before the House of Commons, is in the following terms:—"Your Committee are constrained to believe that no modification of the system of force can effect the suppression of the Slave Trade, and they cannot undertake the responsibility of recommending the continuance of that system." This conclusion, indeed, was come to only by the casting vote of the Chairman, and in the minority we find such names as those of Sir E. Buxton and Sir H. Inglis. It may be revolting to the high Christian philanthropy of such men to withdraw from the attempt, however small may be its success, to crush one of the greatest crimes committed upon the earth. But if we withdraw our squadron from the coast of Africa, is Christian philanthropy left without sphere or object in Africa itself? Has not the very same Committee which recommend that the system of force be given up, pointed, in the concluding sentence of its Report, to the quarter where benevolent zeal may continue still to work, and to work not in despair but hopefully?—"Your Committee entertain the hope that the internal improvement and civilisation of Africa will be one of the most effective means of checking the Slave Trade; and for this purpose that the instruction of the natives by missionary labours, by education, and by all other practical efforts, and the extension of legitimate commerce, ought to be encouraged wherever the influence of England can be directed, and especially where it has already been beneficially exerted."

ART. VII.—1. *Emilia Wyndham.* London.

2. *Jane Eyre.* London.

3. *Fanny Hervey.* London.

It was a deep and beautiful fancy of the old painters to crowd the backgrounds of their pictures with angels' heads and wings, and thus to surround their subjects with an atmosphere of love and beauty. For our own part we are neither Roman Catholics nor Rosicrucians. We believe neither in the guardian saints of the one, nor in the elemental spirits, the sylphs, the gnomes, the nymphs, and the salamanders of the other. We hope nothing from our good dæmon, and fear nothing from our bad one; but under the dominion of our own will, and within the realm of our own fancy, we believe in clouds of the beautiful unseen, (if the apparent contradiction of phrase may be pardoned,) for we recognise them in our mental atmosphere, and we feel that, but for their ministrations, the prose of life would become too dense for a cheerful breathing. Sometimes these sportive children of the brain will deign but to skim with their fairy feet the hill-tops of existence, or to show for a moment their rosy fingers through the bars of the prison-house of our working-day life, again to vanish half-seen into the realms of a formless but teeming chaos. At other times they vouchsafe a less fleeting manifestation, and to the gifted among men it has been granted, from time to time, to wile into identity some few of these bright inhabitants of space, and to present them to us as beautiful and happy images of that for which the heart had been longing, but which the thought was impotent to conceive. Nor can they evade us again when thus clothed with a form; once plucked from non-existence they remain with us for ever. We have *Lydias* and *Chloes*, *Ophelias* and *Rosalinds*, *Gretchens* and *Clärchens*, *Sophia Westerns* and *Di Vernons*, and of the younger generation we have *Emilia Wyndhams* and *Jane Eyres* continually about us, to cheer and to humanize us.

These last we have selected as two, not of the most beautiful it may be, but certainly of the most noteworthy of the many divinities which latterly have come crowding into our "terrestrial halls;" and when we place them side by side, as we propose, in the centre of the group which we would survey, we believe they will be in the position which they occupy, for the present, in the imaginations of many of our readers.

Let us glance at them first in their external aspect. "*Emilia*, full of health and animation, with two very expressive eyes, of whatever colour you please to call them, for no one could decide

the matter; a sweet, delicate mouth, expressive alike of sense, temper, and feeling; a nice steady round chin; abundance of brown hair; a colour like a rose; a light, elastic, but somewhat full-formed figure, with a pair of the most beautiful arms in the world, which last advantage gave a singular elegance to her gestures." On the other hand we have Jane—a pale grey-eyed girl, rather under the middle size, both in height and development of person, with irregular features, and, indeed, no pretension to any kind of beauty but that of expression, and even that conveying to the beholder the idea rather of energy and determination—what is commonly called character, than of the gentler and more loveable qualities; with her dark hair brushed very smooth, carefully dressed in a black frock almost Quaker-like in its extreme simplicity, but having at least the merit of fitting to a nicety her neat and active person, and with a small white tucker, which has no other merit than that of being scrupulously clean.

Which is the favourite? That Emilia is the prettier girl cannot be questioned. That she is far more graceful and agreeable, in the ordinary sense, is also probably true; and when their characters are developed, in their subsequent stories, we are not astonished when we find that it is she whom we ought to love, for, from the first, we had a presentiment that to her our approval must be given; but do we do so instinctively? We believe that we do not; and though we have some difficulty in accounting for the partiality, and still more in justifying it, we plead guilty, for our own part, to a peculiar *penchant* for the wicked looking "pug"* with the pale face and the smoothed hair; and we believe that to the majority of men she is the more attractive character of the two.

The importance of these two characters, indeed, arises from their marking two distinct classes into which pretty nearly all woman-kind (and perhaps mankind also) might be divided,—the one being those whom we ought to love more than we do, the other those whom we do love more than we ought. In the case of the former there is generally some little trifling peculiarity, either of disposition or of manners, which jars upon some antagonistic peculiarity, some taste or prejudice, which we have culpably cherished, till it has attained to an altogether diseased development in ourselves. It is a thousand times overbalanced by other good and noble qualities. If stated by another we would at once dismiss it as unworthy of a moment's regard. When discovered by ourselves we know that we ought to banish it from our

* *Pug* is derived from the Anglo-Saxon *piġa*, which means a little girl! Let not the *etymologists* scoff!

thoughts, but we do not—we cannot. There it remains, a fly in our cup, which forbids us to quaff the nectar at our lips. Such, to a slight—to a very slight—extent, is the case with Emilia Wyndham. Like her author, good, excellent Mrs. Marsh, she is a *wee, wee* bit prosy—the least possible thing “slow.” Sometimes she will linger a little on the obvious—she will perversely demonstrate what nobody can deny; and this is an impatient age! Now, Jane, be her faults what they may, is never tedious; her worst enemy cannot say that she wearies him, and this probably is the reason why she comes in for rather more than her fair share of our love and favour. She never disputes with you except when she is in the wrong, and then there is at least some field for ingenuity, there is something to contend with, and the tools are not likely to lie quite ready to hand. But let it not be supposed from what we have here said that we reprobate altogether the little moral dissertations in which Mrs. Marsh so frequently indulges. Many of them, and particularly those in Emilia Wyndham, are both beautiful and appropriate, happy at once in their object and in their execution; but in her later novels she unquestionably overshoots the mark, and we have often been anxious to convey to her a counsel, which we are convinced would be important for many of the other advocates of virtue and goodness, viz., not to weary her readers by dwelling upon inevitable and obvious consequences, lest she should tempt them, in their impatience, to deny her premises, for no better reason than to shift the ground of the argument, and to furnish her with something like substantial antagonism.

There is another fault, of a kindred nature, at which we would gently hint in referring in the outset, thus generally, to the character of Mrs. Marsh as a novelist—a slight deficiency, namely, of spirit. The fault is a common one in our modern writers of all classes, but particularly in our novelists, and it gives rise to unfavourable impressions regarding the condition of modern society, and modern life. Whenever their pictures are contrasted with the coarser but more vigorous delineations of Fielding and Smollett and the older writers, when Emilia Wyndham, for example, is compared with Sophia Western, we are immediately told, and not unnaturally, that the spirit has gone out of this generation, and that the greater sobriety and regularity of our lives have brought along with them perhaps a more equable, but certainly a less bountiful, flow of vivacity. The cause we take to lie more in the change of our literary than our social habits. In former times there was no such phenomenon as that of a brain, of no extraordinary generative powers, bringing forth an annual novel. There was no such thing as this continual and task-like writing, irrespective of the mental condition of the

writer. In every mind, even the most happily constituted, there must be a frequent unbending of the bow. "*Arcum non semper tendit Apollo*," is as true now as it was of old, and the effort to shoot with it unlent, will not be more successful now than it was then. That the attempt, however, is made continually, the publishers' lists bear witness, and the faithful readers of such authors as Mrs. Marsh will speedily discover to their sorrow. Since the commencement of her short career, she has by her own single pen* produced more than either Fielding, Smollett, or Sterne, during their whole lives, and in this respect she is a mere baby compared with several others, Mrs. Trollope, for example, and the wearisome-unwearied Mr. J. P. R. James, to say nothing of the Parisian Manufacturers. Now, we hold it to be a positive duty for those who are to come before the public at all, in the capacity of original and creative writers, to do so "at full of tide." Whether the flow may at any time be sufficient is a subject of which they may not be altogether the proper judges; but every man knows pretty nearly his own high-water mark, and it is only when he has reached it that he ought to presume to invite the public to bathe in his fancies. The condition of mental activity which we desiderate is not necessarily the result of cheerfulness and tranquillity. It may be brought about by grief, by remorse, by indignation, and by many other states of feeling of the intenser sort; but come how it may, it must be present, or else the pen ought instantly to be laid aside. Languor may be described, but it must never be exhibited; and novels above all, if they are to hold their place in the mental pharmacopœia, must do so as tonics. "*Similia similibus curantur*," if true of the body, is unquestionably false when we come to the mind, and a tiresome novel will prove a sorry remedy for a tedious hour.

There are some to whom mental as well as bodily stimulants seem objectionable, and who would consequently regard the function of the novel, to which we here refer, as unworthy of being taken into account. For our own part, we believe that in the one case, as in the other, moderation, and not abstinence, ought to be the rule of our conduct; and we have no difficulty in imagining circumstances in which the mind may derive health and vigour from the artificial glow which fiction calls forth. The life-boat is launched into the surge with a cheer, the forlorn hope goes cheering into the breach; and we see no reason why our spirits should not be supported by similar means, when we are about to contend with moral instead of physical

* We can count on our fingers some six-and-twenty volumes, and of these eighteen have appeared during the last four years!!!

antagonists. To relieve the tedium of convalescence, to enliven the languor which weighs upon us during the intervals of acute suffering, to distract the mind from a continually present subject of anxiety or of grief, seem to us by no means among the least important functions of the novelist; and for their due performance we think that a greater degree of liveliness would occasionally have been desirable in Mrs. Marsh.

Having meekly hinted these slight dislikes, we have pretty nearly done with our objections to Mrs. Marsh. In the main we love her dearly. She writes as an English gentlewoman should write; and what is better still, she writes what English gentlewomen should read. Her pages are absolutely like green pastures, when we come to them from the barren and terrible scenery of the more ambitious female writers of the day—Madame du Devant, for example, and her English imitator, Miss Jewsbury. We are in no danger with her of falling over a metaphysical precipice into an abyss of unbelief; we feel that her verdure is not indebted for its luxuriance to the heat of a moral volcano. Neither does she belong to those who depend for the interest of their fictions on that which in real life is offensive and disgusting. She seldom paints vicious and degraded characters, or scenes of abject misery; and whilst we remain with her we are pretty safe from having our olfactory nerves regaled by the odours of the workhouse and the dock. Even the “crimes célèbres” have little charm for her; the dagger and the bowl are not among her favourite implements; and she has but one adultery that we remember, that in “The Admiral’s Daughter,” to us the least pleasing of her tales. Emilia Wyndham is a complete example of the style of novel in which Mrs. Marsh is qualified to succeed, whilst in itself it is also the happiest of her creations.

The plot is so simple, that an hundred such might be improvised by any ingenious woman in half an hour, but the really valuable part of a novel—the characterization, (with the exception perhaps of the Cousin-Colonel,) is strongly marked, and often original. We scarcely know anything better than Mr. Danby, and though we have often met with him in the chrysalis state in the world, we do not recollect to have encountered him before in the pages of a novel. To our mind he is by far the most interesting character in the book, and the best male character that Mrs. Marsh has produced, not excepting even those in Mount Sorrel. If we might hazard a conjecture, we should say that Mr. Danby is drawn from the life, else how should it have come into the mind of a woman to represent a lover under a form so uncouth. Vulcan’s advances to Minerva must have been graceful compared with those of the poor old moth-eaten Chancery-Lane

conveyancer to Emilia; and still, though we grudge her to him a little at first, we remember few imaginary lovers for whose success we have ultimately felt so solicitous. Several little circumstances confirmed us in our opinion that Mr. Danby is a portrait, or at all events has been constructed from a very accurate knowledge of the habits and modes of living and thinking of the class of men to which he belongs.* In the first place, we are told "that Mr. Danby did read novels is certain; and except his newspaper, he read nothing else." Now we ourselves know, at this moment, not one, but several Mr. Danbys, whose reading is exactly of the kind described, with this exception, that in place of "reading novels," they read—every novel. No matter what be its subject, or what its quality, whether its author be known or unknown, whether it be in one volume or in three, the circumstance of its being printed, and called a novel, is sufficient for their purpose. They read it from board to board, and "except their newspapers, they read nothing else." Their view of life, indeed, is entirely through the pages of novels, and it would seem to be sufficient, for they are usually very happy and even-tempered men, as Mr. Danby was before he encountered Emilia. Another very characteristic trait from the life is Mr. Danby's carelessness about money, and his habit of handing it over to his mother. His life had been spent in converting his mind into the most perfect money-making machine; but it was in the perfection of the machine, and in its operations alone, that his pride and his pleasure consisted. The producing process he contemplated with the most intense interest, but the production—the result—the money, was comparatively valueless, since he was incapable of enjoying almost anything that it could purchase. His entrusting it to his mother was no proof of affection or confidence in her, though he probably had both, but proceeded entirely from his wish to have it removed, with the smallest possible trouble to himself. He found that the machine could not go on producing until the manufactured article was taken out of the way; and this office she was at hand to perform. Indolence had also probably to do both with this and his general submission, since it is perfectly certain that the most intense application, and willing application too, to one pursuit, is by no means a proof of the presence of active habits.

Mrs. Marsh, like most other novelists, occasionally falls into a very glaring absurdity in the conduct of her story; and here, the entirely objectless concealment, by Emilia from her husband,

* Not of their craft certainly, for she talks of "the parchments upon which he endorsed his conveyances," and commits innumerable blunders of the same description.

without them. But we are by no means clear that graver faults might not have been assigned to Jane. Though there is nothing that is coarse as a human being, there is much about her that is hard, and angular, and indelicate as a woman. Notwithstanding her love for Rochester, we feel that she is a creature more of the intellect than of the affections; and the matter-of-course way in which she, a girl of nineteen, who had seen nothing of the world, receives his revelations of his former life, is both revolting and improbable. To a pure woman they would surely have soiled, for the time at least, the image of him who related them; and for the probability of the story, if for no better reason, we think that different feelings ought to have been assigned to her on this occasion. One of Mrs. Marsh's little homilies would here have been a natural and seemly tribute to virtue. We cannot blame her for ultimately falling in love with Rochester, for in doing so she did nothing more than every woman who has read the book has done since. Proud, tyrannical, violent, and selfish though he was, he had the element of power, which, involuntarily and almost unconsciously, in a woman's eyes, supplies the deficiency of every other good quality; and his system of wooing, apparently indifferent almost to rudeness, was consistent with the theory of the greatest masters in the art. Hear the opinion of Goethe, by the mouth of the "Erfahrene:"

"Geh den Weibern zart entgegen,
Du gewinnst sie auf mein Wort;
Und wer rash ist, und vorwegen,
Kommt vielleicht noch besser fort;
Doch wem wenig dran gelegen
Scheinet, ob er reizt und rührt,
Der beleidigt, der verführt."*

To the same effect Sir John Suckling's exquisite little poem—"Why so pale?"—will at once suggest itself to our readers; and though the witty knight died young, there is little question that, in this matter at least, he was entitled to the character of an "Erfahrener."

The stratagem thus practised, and thus recommended, is a tolerably obvious one when we consider it. As Goethe very

* Which may be rendered or approximated thus:—

He who meek and mildly sues
Shall win her—if the maiden choose;
He who woos with better pluck
Will have, believe me, better luck;
But he who still the matter views
As a piece of careless sport,
Will surprise and storm the fort.

justly remarks, the secret consists in calling forth the "amour propre" of the party attacked, and enlisting it on our side. It is the male counterplot to female coquetterie, and the *modus operandi* consists in throwing upon the party to be gained the *onus* of attacking, and affecting the defensive, in order that we may get the conduct of the siege into our own hands. If the party on whom the duty of besieging has thus been imposed, does not suddenly lose heart, an accident which it is part of the *ruse* to prevent, the game is with the original besieger, for though it may not be always possible to gain a victory, it is always possible to lose one. Such was precisely the game which Rochester played with Jane Eyre. By an affectation of indifference he contrived, in the midst of his passion, to retain the air of superiority, which was one of the principal charms which belonged to him, and to bring matters at last to such a pass that her pride consisted, not in resisting, but in being vanquished. But the weapon which Rochester used, happily for the tone of general society, will be effective, for the most part, only in the hands of a thoroughly well-bred man—skillful though he was, his conduct seems often to tread very hard on the borders of rudeness—almost of brutality; and even to such a character as Jane, it must have been revolting, but for other most attractive qualities which he possessed. He had one of the most enviable attributes of genius, that of sympathizing and of calling forth sympathy. There was no want of compass in his spiritual scale; and whatever note you struck he could speedily supply you with a chord. Jane says, that he "suited her to the finest fibre of her nature." He who reads Swift's "Journal to Stella," will see this quality exhibited in its highest perfection, in a character in some respects resembling that of Rochester, and it is equally conspicuous in Goethe at every turn, and we all know how fatally they both were beloved. This power of entering into the nature of another, is indeed one of the most indispensable qualities of the poet—it is the feeler which he stretches out into the waters of life, and in the possession of it, as in many other respects, Mr. Rochester comes nearer to the man of genius than any hero of romance that we know. He is, besides, a thoroughly manly character, which we do not find to be always the case, even in those whose will is strong. He has no littlenesses at all, he neither frets himself nor others about trifles, he never quarrels with servants, or indeed with anybody lightly, he has no crotchets, no avarice, and above all, no vanity, though abundance of pride. Nobody "toadies" or can "toady" him—he has neither foes nor favourites, though he might well have had friends, and the absence of them is perhaps the greatest blemish in the book. Male companionship could not have been wanting to a character so

masculine. It is in consequence of these qualities that even his selfishness, like his rudeness, becomes less revolting. It is rather an assertion of a right over, than the infliction of a wrong upon, his fellow-creatures. There was a sort of instinctive giving way by those around him, from the feeling that his requirements were the more urgent. Jane's feeling at all events seems to have been precisely that expressed by the poet, where he says—

“ Woman is the lesser man, and all her passions match'd with mine,
Are as moonlight is to sunlight, are as water is to wine.”

The mutual relation of the two characters is, indeed, most admirable. In contemplating the one, we feel its truth from recognising its adaptation to the other. Mankind is said to be manufactured in pairs, and every one of us is supposed to have his counterpart in petticoats—if he could but find her. Rochester had been so long engaged in the search, that he had begun to doubt of the truth of the maxim; he was long past the admiring and the wondering age; women, like most things in life, had become a bore to him, and if any one had told him that he yet was destined to love, he would have said that nothing could be less likely. But the moment that he encountered Jane, he felt that his hour was come—the complement of his own nature stood before him; she was not what he anticipated, what his imagination had pictured, he was disappointed rather with himself than with her, but she filled up the measure of his being such as it was, and since he could not be indifferent, he must e'en be contented. It was no longer a matter of choice, but of necessity, and the complete self-consciousness which he at once exhibited is very characteristic of the manner of man he was. The difference between the male and female character is well preserved in this respect. Jane is long doubtful—she suspects that she is in love, but she is not quite certain; whereas Rochester never doubts for a moment, and the whole of the affair with the vain and stupid Miss Ingram was intended, not to test himself, but Jane. Now Jane from the very first was more in love than he was, but she had not courage to examine the mystery of her own heart, and the consequence was that she deceived herself about her feelings, as women usually do.

The great defect in the otherwise most successful character of Rochester, consists in representing his life as utterly objectless. This we look upon as a positive artistical blunder. No such man could have been contented, during his whole life, to sit tamely and silently by, and see the affairs of mankind, his own included, managed by others. Duty being altogether out of the question, a sort of internal necessity would have prompted him, sooner or later, to make his voice heard. Ambition, in some

form, is seldom wanting to the powerful, and Rochester's love of enjoyment, which seems never to have gained the mastery over his reason, so far from indicating an inaptitude for affairs, went rather to prove the completeness of his nature. Literature may not have been consistent with his early training, and he was too wealthy for a profession; but politics, and social economy, in all their departments, were open to him. He might have been an enthusiastic aspirant after a glorious future, or a pious conservator of the blessings of the past, and in one character or other it is probable he would have sought the arena, if for no other purpose than to flee from the misery of his domestic hearth.

Of the crime which Rochester committed in attempting to marry Jane whilst his wife was alive, we do not think it necessary to say much. A transgression of so heinous a nature, as to come within the reach even of human laws, is not likely to become attractive in the eyes of many. But there are more latent objections to the tendency of this powerful book, which we are apt to overlook on a first perusal, and of the perniciousness of which we can only judge properly, when we have seen them developed in other works, professedly proceeding from the same source. In Jane herself there is a recklessness about right and wrong which is very alarming, and although in the great action of her life, that of leaving Rochester, she valiantly resists a very powerful temptation, and her general conduct is not very reprehensible, the motive by which she is actuated is seldom a higher one than worldly prudence; and there is often a kind of regretful looking-back, which makes us fear that the fate of Lot's wife may overtake her. In the other novels, "*Wuthering Heights*," and "*The Tenant of Wildfellhall*," these, like all the other faults of Jane Eyre, are magnified a thousand-fold; and the only consolation which we have in reflecting upon them, arises from the conviction that they will never be very generally read. With "*Wuthering Heights*" we found it totally impossible to get along. It commences by introducing the reader to a perfect pandemonium of low and brutal creatures, who wrangle with each other in language too disgusting for the eye or the ear to tolerate, and unredeemed, so far as we could see, by one single particle either of wit or humour, or even psychological truth, for the characters are as false as they are loathsome. How it terminates we know not, for the society which we encountered on our first introduction was so little to our taste, that we took the liberty of declining the honour of a farther acquaintance. "*The Tenant of Wildfellhall*" has a better beginning, and the conclusion is an unimpeachable instance of poetical justice; but in the body of the tale there are scenes in which the

author seems to pride himself in bringing his reader into the closest possible proximity with naked vice, and there are conversations such as we had hoped never to see printed in English. There is a coarseness and brutality in the manner of speaking of almost all the characters, never to be met with among gentlefolks, however depraved; and there is a continual use of "slang" throughout the book, even where the author speaks in his own person, which might well have justified our contemporary, if he had pronounced over it, instead of *Jane Eyre*, the social anathema of vulgarity. There is even a frequent inaccuracy of style, and an apparently involuntary slipping into provincialisms, which would lead us to think that, if Currer Bell be the editor of Acton Bell's books, as would seem from their title-pages, he must have been napping on the occasion of this publication.

But with all their faults, there is no denying the family resemblance between these unpleasing productions, and their more happily constituted elder sister. They are vigorous dwarfs, in whose mis-shapen limbs the idea of the same powerful nature is still to be traced; of whom we can say, that if they had not been dwarfs, they would have been strong and beautiful beings. Their fault is deformity, not weakness. Nor is this resemblance perceptible in the characterization only. In the scenery it is even more striking. There is always a wild upland district, with the wind howling through a few gnarled and weather-beaten Scotch firs, or an old untenanted manor-house, buried in trees, and haunted by horrors—not supernatural. In the colouring, so to speak, there is an unity of tone throughout. It is *grey*, and there is an evident partiality for rough and boisterous weather. The artist has a contempt for "the pretty," which might have satisfied our poor friend David Scott himself; but the sketches show an acquaintance with nature in her rougher moods not often to be met with. In two or three words we have the scene so vividly before us, that we seem to experience with our bodily senses the phenomena described. The following picture of a "drear November day" shakes us cold and comfortless. "Afar it offered a pale blank of mist and cloud; near, a scene of wet lawn and storm-beat shrub, with ceaseless rain sweeping away wildly before a long and lamentable blast."

We shall not attempt to resolve the much agitated question of the sex of the author of these remarkable works. All that we shall say on the subject is, that if they are the productions of a woman, she must be a woman pretty nearly unsexed; and *Jane Eyre* strikes us as a personage much more likely to have sprung ready armed from the head of a man, and that head a pretty hard one, than to have experienced, in any shape, the softening influence of female creation.

We would gladly have indulged ourselves in farther speculations on the ever-suggestive subject of Jane Eyre, and illustrated what we formerly hinted at as the true secret of her importance, by dwelling at some length on the peculiarities of that class of young ladies, of which she has been recognised as the type, and which consequently is now beginning to be known by the epithet of "Jane Eyreish;" but our limits forbid us to linger much longer in such fair companionship; and there is a new divinity who has lately made so great an impression on our imagination that we cannot resist the temptation of filling up the number of the graces by still adding her to our group.

This latest born daughter of the fancy rejoices in the not inharmonious name of Fanny Hervey, coupled with the rather unpromising *alias* of "the mother's choice," and is the production, so far as we can discover, of a hitherto unknown, though manifestly far from an unpractised pen. The first thing, indeed, which strikes us on opening the book, is the uncommon purity of the style, and the ease and dexterity with which the dialogue is conducted. We are not at first, nor, indeed, till we have nearly finished the first volume, prepared for the great degree of cleverness which we afterwards recognise, but from the very commencement we are relieved from the apprehension of hard reading. There is a felicity, both of words and images, which at once enlists our good-will, and we travel contentedly, and even cheerfully, through a rather detailed account of the natural history, from their grandfathers downwards, of the various persons of the drama, till, by a natural and easy transition from the level country to the mountain ridge, we arrive at something a great deal better in a very sharp and accurate characterization, and a very acute exhibition of some of the finer shades of sentiment and passion. Fanny Hervey is unquestionably the production of a lady. "The veiled spirit is a gentlewoman." We are here beset by none of the difficulties which prevent us from pronouncing decisively on Jane Eyre; on the contrary, we meet at every turn the results of a certain delicacy of perception of the infinitesimal shades of feeling, which belongs not to the rougher organs of a man, and there is that ever-present intuition of the proper and seemly, which is to be found in a well-bred Englishwoman alone. The book belongs to the purely Modern-Social School of Novels, and its authoress will be classed with Mrs. Marsh and Miss Austen. With less pathos than the first, and less satire, less power, (or less will, it may be,) to bring out the little weaknesses of human nature, than the latter, she has more sensibility than either, the feelings in which she delights are of a more delicate texture, the shades of expression more difficult to be caught, and she consequently paints with a finer touch. The story, stripped of the

accessaries with which it seems to us slightly overloaded, is an extremely simple one. Fanny, the daughter of a quiet and sensible old Admiral, who lived in a little villa on the coast of Sussex, having accompanied her family to a race-ball, is struck with the appearance of a very dignified elderly lady leaning against a pillar, and her lively imagination, and keen sensibilities, are immediately on fire. The lady had come with a very distinguished party, she was said to have been for many years a celebrated London beauty, and to have moved in the very highest circles, and Fanny who has seen nothing of the world, and whose notions of the superior refinement of fashionable people, are extravagant beyond those even of most young ladies of her age, to whom the brightness of the ideal is usually somewhat obscured by an acquaintance with the real, immediately invests her with a perfect halo of grandeur. The "interesting melancholy expression of her face," too, awakens her warmest sympathies, and poor Fanny in short is in an ecstasy of admiration, when her father recognises in the strange lady, his cousin Lucy, a rich heiress, whom he had not seen for many years, but with whom he had spent much of his boyhood, and from whom he had experienced very great kindness on the occasion of his marriage with Fanny's mother. A recognition of the most cordial nature takes place : Mrs. Vernon, such is the lady's name, requests to be introduced to the Admiral's daughters, Fanny and Marian, whose beauty she had already remarked, and conceives on the spot the most ardent affection for Fanny, who resembles an only daughter whom she had lost in Italy shortly before, and whose ardent temperament, and keen sensibilities, she perceives have much in harmony with her own.

Fanny as may be anticipated is adopted by the Vernons, accompanies them to town, and falls in love with their only son, a young officer in the Guards. The attachment is perfectly mutual, but the conduct of young Vernon is so strange and inconsequent, as scarcely to leave a moment's peace to the sensitive Fanny, or to his no less impressionable and anxious mother, who from the first has set her whole heart on the match. He introduces his friend Lord Delverly, and seems to encourage his addresses to Fanny, till the unfortunate man actually falls in love, proposes, and is rejected. Matters seem then to be placed on their proper footing between the lovers. The attachment is acknowledged to be mutual, highly approved by the parents on both sides, and in a word the marriage is fixed ; when the mystery of Vernon's conduct, and of the book, of a sudden makes its appearance. He has all along, as his mother suspected, had a *liaison* with one of Lord Delverly's sisters, a certain Lady Emily Turner, to whom he had originally been engaged, but by

whom he had been renounced at the desire of her family, in order that she might marry a man of much larger fortune. The fatal secret is discovered by his friend at a summer party, at the house of a vain little widow near Richmond; the two young men have a singular sort of fencing match with their guardsmen's swords, and the result, to the utter astonishment of the reader, is, that Vernon is killed—actually spitted with his opponent's weapon, (how could our fair authoress be so unfeeling,) and his body carried down the Thames in a boat.

The "scene" with the sensitive ladies when the sad intelligence reaches them, *we* shall certainly not attempt to describe. Like good Colonel Vernon we confess that the idea of escaping to our club is usually the first one that occurs to us on such occasions, and we will not very positively assert that we were not guilty of skipping just one single page, at this very place. Mrs. Vernon, however, dies of a broken heart, (this much we saw,) and Fanny returns to her father, where, after devoting a proper and becoming time to solitary walks by the sea-shore, tears in her bed-room, and so forth, she, like a sensible girl, marries a worthy excellent young parson, who had been in love with her all the time, and who we have no doubt will make a much better husband than his red-coated rival.

Such are the bare bones of the story. Many of the characters are excellently brought out, and some of them with a fulness which seems to indicate a foundation in reality. Mrs. Vernon is capital—a sensitive and vain, but kind-hearted and clever woman, her temper, which under proper restraint would have been a very lovable one, spoiled by over-indulgence, first as a child, and then as a woman. She is ever suspecting that the unreasonableness of her conduct will bring upon her that which she knows it has long ago merited—the complete alienation of the affections both of her husband and her son, and the consequence is, that she is continually exacting from them fresh proofs of attachment, and thus passes her life in persecuting those whom she loves. Her husband, too, the man whom "the least perceptible threatening of a scene alarmed and discouraged," is wonderfully true to nature. We are certain there are many such, and he has our sympathies beyond, perhaps, what his author altogether intended, whilst the charming Mrs. Vernon possibly has them somewhat less. We believe it will be found no easy task, even for the authoress of *Fanny Hervey*, to enlist the sympathies of grown-up men in behalf of elderly ladies, whose feelings are so fine, that whenever reasoning is attempted with them, they take refuge in their smelling-bottles, who are ready to faint at the very thought of a syllogism, and whose only answer to a dilemma is—*hysterics*. To set Logic at defiance, a woman must

be young and pretty, and even then it ought to be a point of female gallantry not to abuse the privilege, for where the *ultima ratio*, which, in dealing with the rougher sex, might at once be appealed to, is excluded, it is not very generous to decline the combat on the only field that remains.

Young Vernon is as interesting to us as a man can be, who has no higher aspirations than to move gracefully in a fashionable circle. We have here the same complaint to make that we made against Rochester, though on somewhat different grounds, for Mr. Vernon is not represented as capable of taking a higher position among men than he did. But why make a hero of such a man? The function of an humble listener is not a very heroic one surely, and yet such must inevitably have been Mr. Vernon's, whenever chance brought him in contact with the better spirits among the young men of his own class and age. We are told that he was educated at Eton, and that he went to College; now one man, out of every ten who pass through this training, will probably attempt, or at least affect, something more than the *mere* man of pleasure. Why was not this tenth man chosen? Is a man less attractive in the eyes of a woman because he endeavours to be respectable in those of men? Would Fanny have loved Vernon less if she had read his speeches in the Times, heard him plead at the bar, seen his books reviewed, or known that he was entrusted with a foreign mission? Would the dust of the senate or the forum have soiled him in her eyes, or would his attentions have been less flattering, that to others at least his tongue sometimes told another tale than that of love? Would even his *badinage* have been less sprightly because it was the amusement of his leisure, instead of the occupation of his life? or would the graceful ease of his manners have been less imposing, that it proceeded from a consciousness of real superiority? We are aware that in attempting to construct a character of the kind which we have indicated, there might be some danger of falling upon that of an actually existing public man, and a sense of delicacy on this point may have restrained our authoress. But the past is at least as full of examples as the present, and at any rate, we see no reason why something of an upward tendency should not have been given in a general way. We cannot but feel that with such a girl as Fanny, the success of a man like Vernon must have been in consequence of the want of a worthier competitor, and we are certain that to such a person as Fanny's author must be, if he were to present himself in real life, he would appear excessively frivolous. Still she has chosen him for her hero!

Lord Delverly is more manly than Mr. Vernon; his blunt downrightness is an unequivocally male characteristic, and even his weaknesses are those of a man. His chief affectation, for in-

stance, consists in pretending to have less feeling than really belongs to him, and he willingly incurs the imputation of rudeness, in order to escape that of timidity. Even Delverly, however, by no means belongs to the class of Nature's nobles, and it is to the female characters in this pleasing book that we revert again and again with the greatest pleasure. Fanny, the heroine, is charming; we have not met with a creation so perfectly tender and womanly for many a day. A little more strength of character—a little more power of playing the helper, the counsellor, the confidante, would have made her quite our ideal woman, and we should have been ready to envy the good Edmund, and to exclaim with old Götz—"Wen Gott lieb hat, dem geb' er so eine Frau!" But absolute perfection was not the artist's aim. Fanny is altogether a sensitive plant. In circumstances less favourable, her sensibility would have become morbid, and would have manifested itself either in inequality of temper, as in Mrs. Vernon's case, or in a gentle and settled sadness. But thanks to the high principle which an excellent education had instilled, she is always reasonable, never allows her feelings to stand in the way of a necessary appeal to her understanding, and her kind heart is continually beforehand with her judgment in suggesting what ought to be said or done.

But it must not be supposed from our imperfect sketch, or from our dwelling upon one or two of the principal characters, that there is any want of subordinate ministers to the plot. There is a continual rural accompaniment of the most pleasing kind kept up in Sussex, of which the "wood-notes wild" make themselves heard in the abodes of fashionable life, in the shape of letters to Fanny from her sister Marian; and Marian's marriage with Cecil Beckford is in itself a very pleasing episode. Marian is worthy to be Fanny's sister—with a temperament less excitable, and an imagination less lively, she has a character better, because more easily, balanced. The relation between Fanny and Marian is exactly that which we find between sisters; and in the preservation of family-likenesses, in temperament, and general disposition, in the midst of the contrasts which individual peculiarities produce, our fair authoress, if not a professed physiologist, has at least shewn considerable physiological instinct. Vernon is exactly the son of his parents; Fanny is the *nervous* member of her family; and there is an old Mrs. Pemberton, and her daughter Anne, who are indisputably mother and daughter, though the one is crabbed and selfish, and the other all good-nature and disinterestedness. These two characters are quite after the best manner of Miss Austen; and, when taken in conjunction with the old Scotch Doctor, and his rival practitioner, Mrs. Rushworth, the Vicar's wife, who poisons

an old woman in her attempt to give her the benefit of a more modern treatment than that which the Doctor followed, exhibit a talent for humorous delineation which might have been indulged with advantage to a greater extent.

Most mothers, we believe, would readily admit, that the conversation of such a person as the authoress of Fanny Hervey would be invaluable to their daughters, and with this view alone would think it almost a duty to cultivate her personal acquaintance, if an opportunity of doing so should present itself. Now, why should not the more matured and elaborated opinions and reflexions of such a person be equally valuable? The subjects which she here discusses are precisely those on which both young ladies and their mammas would willingly have her opinion, though they might not choose to ask it on a slight acquaintance; and, even if the A. B. case which she puts should not be quite in point, her manner of discussing it will, at any rate, be suggestive of deeper views than would otherwise have occurred to most of her readers. We believe that the reading of such books as this is very often the first thing which calls forth the reflective powers, and forms, in females particularly, that habit of introspection which, though capable, when abused, of degrading the whole character to mere barren subjectivity, is one without which no really noble, because no consciously noble, character can be formed. With the healthy action from without, which most persons in this country experience, the risk is much greater of their leading a purely external, what philosophers call a *spontaneous* life, than of their becoming the victims of a morbid self-contemplation. Of the former class, those who never in their lives were "reflectively conscious of a single mental operation," every one's acquaintance will furnish him with examples, without end; whilst of the latter, those who have not come in contact with Germans know the existence chiefly by report.

- ART. VIII.—1. *Narrative of the United States Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea.* By W. F. LYNCH, U.S.N., Commander of the Expedition. With Maps and numerous Illustrations. London, 1849.
2. *Narrative of an Expedition to the Dead Sea.* From a Diary, by one JOHN PASTY. Edited by EDWARD P. MONTAGUE, attached to the United States' Expedition Ship "Supply." Philadelphia, 1849.

So, the disenchantment of the world goes on ! The world's grey fathers were content with seven wonders. Thirty years ago, we might learn by books that there were at least a hundred wonders of the world ; but where now is there *one* to be found ? No sooner did the phrenologists find out the whereabouts of our faculty of "wonder," or "marvellousness," than straightway there ceased to be anything in the world to wonder at. About a hundred years ago, almost everything beyond our own islands, and even much that was in them, was wonderful to us. The world was so unknown—men and nature were so little understood—that all things beyond the range of every-day experience were marvellous ; and where so much regarded as strange was known to be true, unthought-of and endless wonders were supposed to lie hid in the unascertained portions of the world. Hence the imaginary voyages of Robinson Crusoe, of Philip Quarll, of Richard Davis, of Peter Wilkins, and of Captain Lemuel Gulliver, were scarcely beyond the bounds of human credulity, and were by not a few received as true accounts of true voyages. Indeed, it might have been thought to require some hardihood to distrust even the immortal Captain, seeing that his "true effigies," in a very respectable peruke, were, as we happened lately to notice, prefixed to the early editions of his work. Who shall indeed set bounds to the possibilities of pleasant wonder, when the learned of the land were convinced by the daring impudence of George Psalmanazar, and were eager to send missionaries and Bibles to the interesting people to whom he professed to belong, and for whom he invented a language, the grammar of which seems to us the most daring attempt ever made to throw dust into learned eyes. But, that learned eyes are not always the keenest, seems to be shewn by the temporary success of that most astonishing experiment upon human credulity. O ! happy people, who lived in days when there was something to wonder at—when the fountains of marvellousness, now, in these latter days, dried up, played in full stream, and sprinkled some refreshing excitements over this

dreary life. But what have we now left? All the world has been disenchanted:—every creek and cranny has been explored; and we have long ceased to expect the accounts of newly-discovered islands and continents, which ever and anon gladdened the hearts of our ancestors with something new and marvellous. Even if we had that expectation, it would cease to be exciting. We should be sure that the unknown would be like something we know. There is really nothing new under the sun—nothing even in expectation. Even the interior of Africa, still unexplored—and from whose gates Dr. Bialloblotzky now returns bootless home—is regarded with but languid interest by all but the one in ten thousand who has some zeal for geographical discovery. There is sure to be some sand: But what do we want to know of more sands, and sand-storms, and camels, and all that sort of thing? There is perhaps a lake: Well, there is nothing wonderful in that—we know all about lakes. There are perhaps new tribes of blacks: Nay, spare us—what do we want of any more blacks? We know all about them through and through; and what signifies some trifling addition to their variety—a darker or lighter shade—a stronger or laxer twist of wool—a somewhat less utterable jargon—a somewhat more hideous buggaboo? There is no bracing wonder here. We do not expect a new animal—scarcely a new plant: and when lately we were authentically told of a real wonder, in the shape of a sea-serpent, one-half the world rose in its wrath at the attempt upon its organ of wonder, and at the assault upon its firm purpose not to wonder at any thing the world contains; and the other half turned lazily upon its side, grunting—“Pshaw, what is there wonderful in a sea-serpent? An eel is a sea-serpent—a conger is a sea-serpent—and one somewhat bigger than a conger-eel is no great matter.”

Now-a-days, we know the Persians, the Turks, the Arabs, the Hindoos, better than our grandfathers knew the French, the Italians, the Spaniards, or the Germans. The North-American Indians, the South-Sea Islanders, the Esquimaux, we know far better than the Russians, Danes, and Swedes were known a hundred years ago. Even the Chinese have ceased to amaze us. Their tails—why, fifty years ago we were ourselves not tailless;—their edible bird-nests turn out, when seen and explained, to be nothing *very* strange. Cats may be, after all, not bad eating;—and the small feet of the ladies may, for aught we know, be a salutary domestic institution.

Then, look at the results which the existing facilities of intercourse have produced upon our estimate of places which it was once an untiring wonder to talk of, and a life-adventure to visit. Rome and Naples are as well known to us as Paris was some

fifty years ago. Constantinople is better known to us than Rome was then ; and with Jerusalem, Cairo, Damascus, we have now a far better acquaintance than we had twenty years ago with Petersburg, Lisbon, or Madrid. Palestine once afforded rich material for the play of the associative faculty upon the organ of wonder ; but presently came that great iconoclast, Dr. Robinson of New York, who, by disproving one thing and doubting another, has left but little even there, in that cherished corner of the world, for the wonder of which entire belief is a most essential condition.

Wonder belongs to a time of ignorance, and we say that the days of ignorance have passed. What is there to wonder at ? We know everything : and that which we understand ceases to be wonderful. Look at the map of the world. There is not a spot on which we can lay the finger whose inhabitants are not well known to us. They are differentiated by small matters—dress, habits of life, shades of colour, climatic influences. Strip them of these, and we come by a swift process to our brothers—the sons of a common father—like ourselves in all that is essentially the man ; moved by the same impulses, subject to the same pains and the same pleasures, subdued by the same dreads, and nourished by the same hopes. The psychologist who dissects their souls finds them all as like to one another, and all as like to us, as does the anatomist who explores their bodily frame. So with animals. All the most remarkable creatures of the world have been brought to us from the uttermost parts of the earth ; and existences which to our grandfathers were all but fabulous, we now regard as familiar things. Our zoological gardens and menageries ; our “ Penny Magazines ” and “ Museums of Animated Nature,” have quite disenchanted this branch of the world’s life. Its strangest things have passed from the realm of wonder ; and the discovery of a really new beast, or bird, or reptile, would now awaken but a languid interest in the general mind. So of plants. Where are their wonders now ? Within thirty years, thousands of plants from all parts of the globe, most of which had not even been heard of, and many of which were examined with wonder, have become the well-known inmates of our stoves, our green-houses, and even our gardens. A morning’s walk, or a short ride, will take any inhabitant of London and other large towns among the most remarkable forms of transmarine vegetation. Here are the palms and bananas of tropical climes, breathing an atmosphere by which you are almost suffocated ; there a thousand whimsical shapes of the cacti and of the unearthly orchids meet the view ; and here the singular pitcher-plants distil their waters. Depart now, wonder-proof ! Travel where you will, you will see, you can see, nothing to astonish—nothing

more wonderful than that which you have seen with your own eyes at home.

And even in the phenomena of nature, the age of wonder has passed. We know everything; we can account for everything. Gases, vapours, and electric fluids are familiar things. We not long ago looked upon their spontaneous operations in nature with awe and wonder. But by and bye we grew bold in the presence of those awful powers. We ventured to lay our hands upon their manes, we vaulted upon their backs, and soon bowed down their terrible strength to our service.

Besides, this in which we have lived has been in all respects a most extraordinary age. It has been full of all kinds of wonders—social, moral, historical, physical, scientific—so vast, so prodigious, as to render familiar to us, as matters of present interest and daily thought, results and facts, greater, intrinsically more strange, than any that past ages, or any that distant countries offer to our notice. This has tamed down the sense of wonder. We can wonder at nothing; for nothing is so wonderful as the things that have become our daily food. Even history is disenchanting. The strangest things have become comprehensible, possible, commonplace. The great conquerors of ancient days have in our own times been surpassed. The revolutions—the changes of past times—each one of which was a subject of curious speculation, have been exceeded in our own days. Subversions, any one of which was erewhile good talk for a century, have been crowded upon us by the dozen within the space of a few weeks. If the sense of wonder in civilized man has not been wholly destroyed, we cannot doubt that this age in which we live will be looked back upon by our children's children as more replete with wonders than any which the world's history has hitherto recorded.

But what has all this to do with the Dead Sea? it may be asked. Much every way. Amid the general diswonderment of the world, we could feel that at least the Dead Sea, with all its mysteries, its horrors and marvels, was left to us. It became a sort of safety-valve for the fine old faculty—the source of so much innocent excitement, which was smothered everywhere else under heavy masses of dull facts and circumstances. But gradually, and with aching hearts, we have seen this retreat cut off from us. One traveller after another has stripped off some one of the horrors which overhung its deeps, or rested on its shores; and now at last it stands naked before us—a monument, indeed, of God's wrath against the sins of man, but invested with none of the supernatural horrors ascribed to it, or exhibiting any of the features which are not the natural and inevitable effect of the peculiar condition into which it has been brought.

As the books now before us bring all the questions with respect to this Lake into their final condition, they afford us a favourable opportunity of stating the question as regards the past history of the Dead Sea horrors, and of showing what has been really done by the Expedition in advancement of our knowledge. In this we must rely chiefly upon our own resources; for the Commander of the Expedition helps us very little further than by stating what he saw, and what he did. He appears to have had a sincere zeal in the enterprise, which originated in his suggestions, and he exhibited much energy and considerable tact in carrying out his objects in spite of the obstacles he encountered. He also knew *how* to observe, at least as a sailor, and he states well and clearly the process and results of his observation; but he scarcely knew *what* to observe, and certainly has not turned the rare advantages committed to him to all the account of which they would have been susceptible in the hands of a more literate traveller. Oh, that Dr. Robinson or Eli Smith had been of the party! Between their learning and deep studies in Palestine geography, and Lieutenant Lynch's practical energies, we might have had something far more worthy than the book before us of being set forth as the result of this most praiseworthy and liberal enterprise, which is in every way most creditable to the United States Government, and contrasts advantageously with the unutterable meanness of our own Government in all things of the sort. What is there in our position which places the inevitable mark of shabbiness, procrastination, and futility upon whatever our rulers do for the encouragement (!) of literature, art, and scientific investigation? Despotism act handsomely in such matters. So, as we now see, in this and other instances, can a Republican Government, quite as amenable as our own to the people for the employment of public money. Whence this unhappy *peculiarity*, for it is no less, of *our* position among the nations of the earth—with wealth more abundant—dominions more widely spread—and advantages far greater than any other nation ever possessed? We hope to look into this matter some day; but must now keep to our text.

Before proceeding to state the results which have been promised, we may give the reader some notion of the books before us. The second and smaller of them has been procured with difficulty; and the accounts which fell under our notice in American papers might have been sufficient to prevent the desire to see it; but it occurred to us that the different position and point of view of the writer would induce him to state some particulars which might throw light on the other account, or furnish some points of comparison with, or of contrast to it. We are bound to say, that in this case there has been discreditable haste even in the authentic

account by the Commander of the Expedition, in taking advantage of the public curiosity, without proportionate regard to the real advantage of the public and the interests of science, by the preparation of a well-digested account of the explorations. The writer actually apologizes for the manifest defects of his book on that very ground.

“As soon as possible after our return I handed in my official report, and, at the same time, asked permission to publish a narrative or diary, of course embracing much, necessarily elicited by visiting such interesting scenes, that would be unfit for an official paper. To this application I was induced by hearing of the proposed publication of a Narrative of the Expedition, said to be by a member of the party. The permission asked was granted by the Hon. J. G. Mason, Secretary of the Navy, with the remark,—‘I give this assent with the more pleasure, because I do not think that you should be anticipated by any other who had not the responsibility of the enterprise.’

“Feeling that what may be said on the subject had better be rendered imperfectly by myself than by another, I have been necessarily hurried; and the reader will decide whether the narrative which follows was elaborately prepared, or written *‘currente calamo.’*”—
Pp. v. vi.

It would, however, have been much better that it should not have been so written. The object was not adequate to justify the production of a very crude account—which this certainly is—of an Expedition to which the public funds had been applied, and in the results of which all Christendom was interested. After all, the rival account was produced before the authentic statement appeared; and the object of haste being thus frustrated by a work which could satisfy no cultivated mind, more time might have been safely taken. Perhaps, indeed, our worthy sailor could not, with any amount of time, have produced a much better book; and we regret that he had not been advised to put his materials into hands better qualified than his own to do them justice. Dr. Robinson might have made something of them. The lesser book, however, appeared before the other, and was an obvious and gross attempt to forestall the market. On its appearance it was disavowed by Lieutenant Lynch; and from the explanations which passed on both sides in the American papers, but which do not appear in either of these volumes, it seems that Mr. Montague is an Englishman, who held a petty officer's berth on board the “Supply.” He was left ill of the small-pox at Port Mahon on the outward passage, and saw nothing of the Expedition from the 1st of February 1848, two months before it landed in Syria, until it re-embarked at Malta on the 12th September following. It is evident, therefore, that he has no responsibility save of literary execution for that part which relates

to this long interval, and which, he alleges (but not in the book) was prepared from the diary of one of the men. His claim to any peculiar qualification for this task is not very clear, unless it be that he performed part of the outward voyage with those who afterwards formed the exploring party—and to which very common run he devotes no less than ninety pages. Again, he was with them for several weeks on the homeward voyage, and might have picked up by questioning the men all that he here states. But we believe, from internal evidence, that he had, as he states, the diary of one of the men for his guidance. There is, indeed, in the part Montague might have furnished for his own observations, the same vile taste, the same school-boy balderdash, and the same wretched fore-castle slang as in the rest; but it is only afterwards that we encounter the peculiar American crow which pervades the rest of the volume, and continually starts up in such delicious phrases as,—“We Yankee boys flinch not: we fear neither the wandering Arab nor the withering influence of disease; we fear neither the heat of the sun nor the suffocating sirocco. We have determined souls, enduring constitutions, plenty of provisions, lots of ammunition, swords, bowie knife, pistols, Colt’s revolvers, and a blunderbuss which is capable to scatter (*sic*) some fatal dozes among any hostile tribe; we have officers as determined, cool, and brave as—ourselves (!); and for a commander, one of the best, most humane, thoughtful, and generous men in the world, who lacks nothing in the sense of ‘bravery,’ and the resolute ‘go-a-head’ spirit of a real, true-born American.” Again—“We Yankee boys can perform wonders, and are not yet out of spirits.” Again—“Such an accumulation of difficulties and disappointments are sufficient to cause any other than *Americans* to give up to despair.” Again—“However, the true-born, undaunted American never flinches from his duty,”—and so on, “cock-a-doodle doo!” after the manner of Captain Ralph Stackpole, throughout. From this and other signs, we have no doubt that *this* account of the Expedition was drawn from the notes of one of the American sailors (they were all picked native-born Americans) of the Expedition; and though upon the whole a worthless, trashy book, one may pick up a notion or two out of it, seeing that it is at least real, when we are enabled to view the same object through the eyes of *both* the commander and of one of his men.

The larger and authoritative work will considerably disappoint expectation on the grounds at which we have already hinted. Notwithstanding the gallant author’s disavowal of “author craft,” the work has most visible signs of book-making. The information respecting the proceedings of the Expedition is not advantageously exhibited, for want of adequate information in the writer;

and taking it as it is, it might, with great advantage, have been compressed within half the space over which it is spread; for there is much in the volume on common and exhausted topics and places before we come to the Jordan and after we leave the Dead Sea. It may also be added that the book is disfigured by much of a kind of uncouth and very commonplace sentimentality, which is fearfully out of keeping in the account of a scientific Expedition. Perhaps, however, the very qualities which detract from the value of the work in the eyes of serious philosophers may help it much in the circulating libraries—and it is certainly a sufficiently readable book. In our esteem the value of the work is greatly enhanced by the engravings. These are from drawings by Lieutenant Dâle, the second in command of the Expedition, and who appears to have well merited the designation of a “skilful draughtsman,” which is given to him. The interest of these lies in their representing subjects mostly new to the eyes of those who have been wearied with the five-hundredth repetition of the same scenes and objects. The views on the Dead Sea are of special and remarkable interest, and the costume figures are also striking and suggestive, although with one or two exceptions very wretchedly engraved; and the effect of the Arabian figures is spoiled by the stiff cable ropes which are twined around the *koofeyehs*, or head-shawls, in place of the soft twists of wool or camels’ hair of which this head-band is really composed. . But the sketch-map of the whole course of the Jordan between the lakes of Tiberias and Asphaltites, with its rapids and innumerable bends, and that of the Dead Sea, through its whole extent and in its true shape and proportions, are both invaluable; and their production, without a word of letterpress, were well worth the whole cost and labour of the Expedition.

The history of that Expedition we may now state, before examining the results which it has realized.

After the surrender of Vera Cruz in May 1847, when there was no more work for the United States’ navy in these parts, Lieutenant Lynch applied to his Government for leave to circumnavigate and thoroughly explore the Dead Sea. After some consideration, a favourable decision was given, and he was directed to make the requisite preparations. At the beginning of October the Lieutenant was ordered to take the command of the store ship “Supply,” formerly the “Crusader.” This vessel was to be laden with stores for the squadron in the Mediterranean; and while preparing for this regular duty, the commander made the arrangements that appeared needful for the more special service. He had constructed, by special authority, two metallic boats, one of copper and the other of galvanized iron. These

boats were so constructed as to be taken to pieces for convenience of transport across the land; but, as the taking the boats apart was a novel experiment, and might prove unsuccessful, two low trucks (or carriages without bodies) were provided, for the purpose of endeavouring to transport the boats entire from the Mediterranean to the Sea of Galilee. The trucks, when fitted, were taken apart, and compactly stowed in the hold, together with two sets of harness for horses. The boats, when complete, were hoisted in, and laid keel-up on a frame prepared for them; and with arms, ammunition, instruments, tents, flags, sails, oars, preserved meats, cooking utensils, the preparations were complete. Nothing that could conduce to the safety or success of the Expedition seems to have been overlooked. Air-tight gum-elastic water-bags were even procured, to be inflated when empty, for the purpose of serving as life-preservers to the crew in case of the destruction of the boats. Great care was also taken in the selection of the crew intended for the special service. Ten "young, muscular, native-born Americans, of sober habits," were chosen, and from each of them was exacted a pledge to abstain from intoxicating drinks. "To this stipulation," says the commander, "under Providence, is principally to be ascribed their final recovery from the extreme prostration consequent on the severe privations and great exposure to which they were unavoidably subjected." Besides these few men, Lieutenant Dale and Midshipman Aulick were attached to the Expedition; and the commander had with him his son, who took charge of the herbarium. Thus the party consisted in all of fourteen persons, to whom were subsequently added, as volunteers, Mr. Bedlow and Dr. Anderson, the former at Constantinople, and the latter at Beirut, where also an interpreter was acquired in the person of an intelligent native Syrian, called Ameuny. We should like to know whether this was the person of the same name who, a few years back, studied in King's College, London. We feel almost sure that this is the same person; and, in that case, we know that he was qualified to render far greater services to the Expedition than he has credit for on the face of the narrative.

The Supply sailed from New York on the 21st November 1847, and reached Smyrna on the 18th February 1848. From Smyrna the officers of the Expedition proceeded to Constantinople in the Austrian steamer, with the view of obtaining from the Sultan, through the American minister, permission to pass through a part of his dominions in Syria, for the purpose of exploring the Dead Sea, and of tracing the Jordan to its source. The account of this journey occupies too much space; and even the writer of the lesser account, although avowedly remaining

behind at Smyrna, treats us to an account of Constantinople, prepared, it would seem—like the other notices of places which he is fond of thrusting in—from those invaluable authorities, the geography books for the use of schools.

The commander had the honour of an audience of the young Sultan, and manifests some disposition to plume himself upon the Republican freedom of his demeanour. There is, we must say, much bad taste of this sort throughout the book. We are also indulged with some rather twaddling observations upon the character of the Sultan, and the impending downfall of the Turkish empire. The latter is a subject on which we are sorely tempted to have our say too; but we will not at this time allow even Lieutenant Lynch to seduce us from our proper theme. The desired authorization was granted; and the Sultan even appeared to manifest some interest in the undertaking, and requested to be informed of the results.

Thus armed with all necessary powers, the officers returned to Smyrna, rejoining the *Supply*, which sailed the next day (March 10) for the coast of Syria, and, after touching at Beirut and other places, came to anchor in the Bay of Acre, under Mount Carmel, on the 28th.

The Expedition men, with the stores, the tents, and the boats, having landed, an encampment was formed on the beach, and the *Supply* departed to deliver to the American squadron the stores with which it was charged, with orders to be back in time for the re-embarkation of the exploring party. "With conflicting emotions," writes Lieutenant Lynch, "we saw the *Supply* stand out to sea. Shall any of us live to tread again her clean familiar deck? What matters it! We are in the hands of God, and, fall early or fall late, we fall with his consent." There was certainly room for serious reflection. The fates of the unhappy Costigan, and more recently of Lieutenant Molynoux, both of whom perished of fever caught on the Dead Sea, were but too well calculated to damp the spirits of the adventurers. Even the thoughtless sailors felt this influence:—

"We had been told," it is stated in the Montague book, "that there never was an expedition planned to explore the Dead Sea which had prospered; some fatality, like the unerring dart of an eagle, had always pounced upon its brave fellows: they had been sick, and lingered but a short while, and had died in this unfriendly climate; or had been attacked by the bloodthirsty Arabs, plundered, and then murdered. These things had taken place so recently, that the murderer has scarce sheathed his sword—the smoke from his pistol has scarce died away in the atmosphere—the unerring spear has scarce stayed from its quivering—and the blood of the murdered has scarcely yet

been dried up by the prevailing heat, or absorbed by the surrounding earth. But we Yankee boys," &c.

The first difficulty of a practical nature was how to get the boats across to the Sea of Tiberias. The copper boat, we should have noticed, was named Fanny Mason, and the other Fanny Skinner—two very pretty and appropriate names for the navigation of the Sea of Death. The boats, mounted on the trucks, were laden with the stores and baggage of the party, and all was arranged most conveniently—only the horses could not be persuaded to draw. The harness was also found to be much too large for the small Syrian horses; and although they manifestly gloried in the strange equipment, and they voluntarily performed sundry gay and fantastic movements, the operation of pulling was altogether aversive to their habits and inclination. What was to be done? Oxen might have been tried, and we have no doubt that they would have performed the task well; but they were all engaged in the labours of the field, it being now "the height of *seed-time*," (which must be a mistake for *harvest*), and Lieutenant Lynch generously hesitated to withdraw them from that essential labour. He was thinking of taking the boats to pieces, though most reluctant to adopt that course, when the idea of trying whether camels might not be made to draw in harness crossed his mind. The experiment was tried; and all hearts throbbed with gratitude as the huge animals, three to each, marched off with the trucks, the boats upon them, with perfect ease. It was a novel sight, witnessed by an eager crowd of the natives, to whom the successful result disclosed an unknown accomplishment in the patient and powerful animal, which they had before thought fit only to plod along with a heavy load upon his back.

This difficulty, and some others, thrown in their way by the Governor of Acre, being removed, the party at length set forth from the coast on the 4th of April. They were accompanied by "a fine old man, an Arab nobleman, called Sherif Hazza of Mecca, the thirty-third lineal descendant of the prophet." As he appeared to be highly venerated by the Arabs, Lieutenant Lynch thought it would be a good measure to induce him to join the party; and he was prevailed upon to do so with less difficulty than had been anticipated. Another addition to the party was made next day in the person of a Bedouin sheikh of the name of Akil, with ten well-armed Arabs. This person, described as a powerful border sheikh, had become known to them at Acre, and on now visiting him at his village of Abelin, he was induced to attend the Expedition "with ten spears," which, with the sheikh and sherif, and the servants of the latter, made fifteen Arabs in all. The exploring party itself amounted

to sixteen, with the interpreter and cook ; so that altogether, with the Arabs gallantly mounted, with their long tufted spears, the mounted scamen in single file, the laden camels, and the metal boats, with flags flying, mounted on carriages drawn by huge camels, the party presented rather an imposing aspect. "It looked," says the commander, proudly, "like a triumphal march."

Some difficulty was experienced in getting the boats over the broken and rocky upper country, the roads being no better than mule tracks ; but by breaking off a crag here, and filling up a hollow there, and by sometimes abandoning the road altogether, difficulties were overpassed, and the whole equipage reached the brink of the slopes overlooking the basin of the Galilee lake. How to get them down into the water was still some question.

"Took all hands up the mountain to get the boats down. Many times we thought that, like the herd of swine, they would rush precipitately into the sea. Every one did his best, and at length success crowned our efforts. With their flags flying we carried them triumphantly beyond the walls [of Tiberias] uninjured, and amid a crowd of spectators, launched them upon the blue waters of the sea of Galilee—the Arabs singing, clapping their hands to the time, and crying for *backshish*—but we neither shouted nor cheered. From Christian lips it would have sounded like profanation. A look upon that consecrated lake ever brought to remembrance the words, 'Peace, be still!' which not only repressed all noisy exhibition, but soothed for a time all worldly care. Buoyantly floated the two 'Fannies,' bearing the stars and stripes—the noblest flag of freedom now waving in the world. Since the time of Josephus and the Romans no vessel of any size has sailed upon this sea ; and for many, many years but a solitary keel has furrowed its surface."—P. 162.

This "solitary keel" is, it appears, the same that the party bought for six pounds, and put in repair to relieve the other boats in transporting the baggage. It was called "Uncle Sam ;" and on the 10th of April the boats were pushed off from the shelving beach, and sought the outlet of the Jordan ; Uncle Sam, rowed by Arabs, being preceded by his two fair daughters—Fanny Mason leading the way, closely followed by Fanny Skinner ; the allied Bedouins, with the cattle, proceeding along the shore, under the command of Lieutenant Dale. The real business of the Expedition here commenced, and, aware of this, the commander made a division of labour, assigning to each officer and volunteer his appropriate duty. Mr. Dale was to make topographical sketches of the country ; Dr. Anderson was to make geological observations and collect specimens ; Mr. Bedlow was to note the aspect of the country on the land route and the incidents that occurred on the march ; Mr. F. Lynch was to collect plants and flowers for the herbarium ; to Mr. Aulick, who

had charge of the *Fanny Skinner*, was assigned the topographical sketch of the river and its shores; and Lieutenant Lynch himself, in the *Fanny Mason*, undertook to take notes of the course, rapidity, colour, and depth of the river and its tributaries, the nature of its banks, and of the country through which it flowed—the vegetable productions, and the birds and animals which might be seen, and also to keep a journal of events.

The descent of the river occupied above a week, as the bathing place of the pilgrims, somewhat above the Dead Sea, was not reached until the night of the 17th. During this time the water party had generally, in the evening, joined the land party on the shore, and remained encamped until the morning. But little information concerning the river could be obtained at Tiberias, and it was therefore with considerable consternation that the course of the Jordan was soon found to be interrupted by frequent and most fearful rapids. Thus, to proceed at all, it often became necessary to plunge with headlong velocity down the most appalling descents. So great were the difficulties, that on the second evening the boats were not more than twelve miles in direct distance from Tiberias. On the third morning it became necessary to abandon poor Uncle Sam, from its shattered condition. It was seen that no other kind of boats in the world, but such as those which had been brought from America, combining great strength with buoyancy, could have sustained the shocks they encountered. The boats were indeed sorely bruised, but not materially injured, and a few hours sufficed to repair all damages.

The immense difference between the levels of the Lake of Tiberias and the Dead Sea—the latter having been, by the best observations hitherto obtained, ascertained to be no less than 984 feet lower than the former—had recently been called in question both by Dr. Robinson and Carl Ritter. In the "*Bibliotheca Sacra*" for August 1848, Dr. Robinson has a statement on the subject, which may be thus summed up:—

The result of the survey made by Lieutenant Symonds of the Royal Engineers gives 1311·9 feet for the depression of the Dead Sea, and 328 for that of the Lake of Tiberias below the sea-level of the Mediterranean. Seeing that the distance between the two lakes does not exceed one degree, this would give to the river Jordan, which passes from the one to the other, a descent of 16·4 feet per mile. Of several rapid rivers, whose course is stated, the lower part of the Orontes, "roaring over its rocky bed," and unnavigable, and the Missouri at the Great Falls, are the only ones whose rapidity of descent can compare with this. "But the Jordan, so far as known, has neither cataracts nor rapids, and its flow, though swift, is silent. Yet, of the 984 feet

of its descent in 60 geographical miles, there is room for three cataracts, each equal in descent to Niagara : and there would still be left to the river an average fall equal to the swiftest portion of the Rhine, including the cataract of Schaffhausen." On these grounds Dr. Robinson hinted there might probably be some error in the calculation, affecting the results. We must admit there was ample ground for the doubt thus expressed, and which the great Prussian geographer declared that he shared—but seeing that a few weeks were destined signally to subvert the whole reasoning, and the doubt that rested on it, there is a striking resemblance between this and Mr. Cobden's famous declaration respecting the unchangeable peacefulness of Europe. The great secret of this depression is solved by our explorers on the basis of the very facts whose non-existence Dr. Robinson too hastily assumed. First, there *are* rapids. The boats plunged down no less than twenty-seven very threatening ones, besides a great number of lesser magnitude ; and then, although the direct distance between the two lakes does not exceed sixty miles, yet the distance actually traversed by the stream in its course—found to be exceedingly tortuous—is at least 200 miles, reducing the average fall to not more than six feet in each mile, which the numerous rapids in that distance render very comprehensible. Thus the great depression of the Dead Sea below the Lake of Tiberias is established both by scientific calculation and by actual observation—by two independent lines* of proof, which support and corroborate each other.

The larger narrative traces with great and proper minuteness the changing aspects and circumstances of the river at the successive stages of progress. These details are so numerous and so various that it is difficult to generalize them. We are, therefore, glad that Montague's sailor, in his more general and less responsible view, supplies a few lines, which, corroborated as they are by the Commander, will serve our purpose well. He says,—

"The banks of the Jordan are beautifully studded with vegetation. The cultivation of the ground is not so extensive as it might be, and as it would be, if the crops were secured to the cultivator from the desperadoes who scour the region. The waters of the Jordan are clear and transparent, except in the immediate vicinity of the rapids and falls. It is well calculated for fertilizing the valleys of its course. There are often plenty of fish seen in its deep and shady course ; but we see no trace of the lions and bears which once inhabited its thickets : now and then are to be seen footsteps of the wild boar, which sometimes visits the neighbourhood."

The wide and deeply depressed plain through which the river flows, is generally barren, treeless, and verdureless ; and the

mountains, or rather, the cliffs and slopes of the risen uplands, present, for the most part, a wild and cheerless aspect. The verdure—such as it is—may only be sought on and near the lower valley or immediate channel of the Jordan. No one statement can apply to the scenery of its entire course; but the following picture, which refers to nearly the central part of the river's course, some distance below Wady Adjluu, is a good specimen of the kind of scenery which the passage of the river offers. It is also a very fair example of the style in which Lieutenant Lynch works up the passages he wishes to be most effective:—

“The character of the whole scene of this dreary waste was singularly wild and impressive. Looking out upon the desert, bright with reverberated light and heat, was like beholding a conflagration from a window at twilight. Each detail of the strange and solemn scene could be examined as through a lens.

“The mountains towards the west rose up like islands from the sea, with the billows heaving at their bases. The rough peaks caught the slanting sunlight, while sharp black shadows marked the sides turned from the rays. Deep-rooted in the plain, the bases of the mountains heaved the garment of the earth away, and rose abruptly in naked pyramidal crags, each scar and fissure as palpably distinct as though within reach, and yet we were hours away; the laminations of their strata resembling the leaves of some gigantic volume, wherein is written, by the hand of God, the history of the changes he has wrought.

“Toward the south, the ridges and higher masses of the range, as they swept away in the distance, were aerial and faint, and softened into dimness by a pale transparent mist.

“The plain that sloped away from the bases of the hills was broken into ridges and multitudinous cone-like mounds, resembling tumultuous water at ‘the meeting of two adverse tides;’ and presented a wild and chequered tract of land, with spots of vegetation flourishing upon the frontiers of irreclaimable sterility.

“A low, pale, and yellow ridge of conical hills marked the termination of the higher terrace, beneath which swept gently this lower plain with a similar undulating surface, half-redeemed from barrenness by sparse verdure and thistle-covered hillocks.

“Still lower was the valley of the Jordan—the sacred river!—its banks fringed with perpetual verdure; winding in a thousand graceful mazes; the pathway cheered with songs of birds, and its own clear voice of gushing minstrelsy; its course a bright line in this cheerless waste. Yet beautiful as it is, it is only rendered so by contrast with the harsh, calcined earth around.”—Pp. 232, 233.

Of the manner in which the rapids were passed, the following passage will afford an adequate notice:—

“At 10. 15 A.M., cast off and shot down the first rapid, and stopped to examine more closely a desperate-looking cascade of eleven feet.

In the middle of the channel was a shoot at an angle of about sixty degrees, with a bold, bluff, threatening rock at its foot, exactly in the passage. It would therefore be necessary to turn almost at a sharp angle in descending, to avoid being dashed in pieces. This rock was on the outer edge of the whirlpool, which a caldron of foam swept round and round in circling eddies. Yet below were two fierce rapids, each about 150 yards in length, with the points of black rocks peering above the white and agitated surface. Below them, again, within a mile, were two other rapids—longer, but more shelving, and less difficult.

“Fortunately a large bush was growing upon the left bank, about five feet up where the rush of the water from above had formed a kind of promontory. By swimming across some distance up the stream, one of the men had carried over the end of a rope, and made it fast around the roots of the bush. The great doubt was whether the hold of the roots would be sufficient to withstand the strain, but there was no alternative. In order not to risk the men, I employed some of the most vigorous Arabs in the camp to swim by the side of the boats, and guide them if possible clear of danger. Landing the men, therefore, and tracking the Fanny Mason up stream, we shot her across; and gathering in the slack of the rope, let her drop to the brink of the cascade, where she fairly trembled and bent in the fierce strength of the sweeping current. It was a moment of intense anxiety. The sailors had now clambered along the banks, and stood at intervals below, ready to assist us if thrown from the boat and swept towards them. One man with me in the boat stood by the line; a number of Arabs were upon the rocks and in the foaming water, gesticulating wildly, their shouts mingling with the roaring of the boisterous rapids, and their dusky forms contrasting strangely with the effervescing flood, and five on each side, in the water, were clinging to the boat, ready to guide her clear of the threatening rock if possible.

“The Fanny Mason in the meanwhile swayed from side to side of the mad torrent like a frightened bird, straining the line which held her. Watching the moment when her bows were in the right direction, I gave the signal to let go the rope. There was a rush—a plunge—an upward leap, and the rock was cleared—the pool was passed! and, half-full of water, with breathless velocity, we were swept safely down the rapids. Such screaming and shouting! The Arabs seemed to exult more than ourselves. It was in seeming only. They were glad—we were grateful. Two of the Arabs lost their hold, and were carried far below us, but were rescued with a slight injury to one of them.”—Pp. 189, 190.

The following, which is one of the best descriptions, has reference to an earlier portion of the river's course, about one-third from the Lake of Tiberias:—

“For hours in their swift descent the boats floated down in silence—the silence of the wilderness. Here and there were spots of solemn beauty. The numerous birds sang with a music strange and mani-

fold; the willow branches were spread upon the stream like tresses, and creeping mosses and clambering weeds, with a multitude of white and silvery little flowers, looked out from among them; and the cliff swallow wheeled over the falls, or went at his own will, darting through the arched vistas, and shadowed and shaped by the meeting foliage on the banks; and above all, yet attuned to all, was the music of the river, gushing with a sound like that of shawms and cymbals. There was little variety in the scenery of the river; to-day the streams sometimes washed the bases of the sandy hills, at other times meandered between low banks, generally fringed with trees and fragrant with blossoms. Some points presented views exceedingly picturesque—the mad rushing of a mountain torrent, the song and sight of birds, the overhanging foliage and glimpse of the mountains far over the plain, and here and there a gurgling rivulet pouring its tribute of crystal water into the now muddy Jordan; the western shore was peculiar from the high calcareous limestone hills which form a barrier to the stream when swollen by the efflux of the Sea of Galilee during the winter and early spring; while the left and eastern bank was low and fringed with tamarisk and willow, and occasionally a thicket of lofty cane, and tangled masses of shrubs and creeping plants, gave it the appearance of a jungle. At one place we saw the fresh track of a tiger [leopard?] on the low clayey margin, where he had come to drink. At another time, as we passed his lair, a wild boar started with a savage grunt, and dashed into the thicket; but for some moments we tracked his pathway by the shaking cane, and the crashing sound of broken branches.

“The birds were numerous; and at times, when we issued from the shadow and silence of a narrow and verdure-tinted part of the stream into an open bend where the rapids rattled and the light burst in, and the birds sang their wilderness song, it was, to use a simile of Mr. Bedlow, like a sudden transition from the cold dull-lighted hall, where gentlemen hang their hats, into the white and golden saloon, where the music rings, and the dance goes on.”—Pp. 212, 213.

The passage of the river was accomplished without any real opposition from the neighbouring Arabs—all hostile demonstration being apparently held in check by the manifest strength of the party. Some friendly intercourse, indeed, took place at different points. We observe generally that the explorers, with their minds pre-occupied with ideas of North American Indians, greatly underrate the position, character, and knowledge of the Arabs. Indeed they are plainly called “savages;” but they are not savages, unless the patriarchal fathers of Scripture history were savages, which no one ever thought. This misapprehension of the Arabs is, of course, exhibited in a still more exaggerated form in the narrative of Montague’s sailor, whose less cultivated perceptions are still more obtuse. He ventures to say in one place that the Arabs wondered how the boats could walk the waters without legs!

All this that relates to the Jordan is new, valuable, and important. It is the real, great work of the Expedition. We absolutely knew next to nothing about the river between the two lakes before, except just below where it leaves the upper lake, and just above where it enters the lower; but here the whole river is set forth before us, and all the mysteries connected with its course are completely solved. For this, the commander is well entitled to the gold medal by the Royal Geographical Society, which we should hope will be awarded to him. In the Dead Sea, the additions to our knowledge are less striking and important. The lake had been viewed at nearly all points by different travellers; the comparison of whose statements furnished a sufficiently correct idea of the figure and directions of the lake, and of the peculiar phenomena which it offers. In most respects, therefore, the business here was not to discover anything new, but to verify previous accounts; and in most respects, all the accounts given by the best of former travellers—especially such as subvert the old traditions of the lake—are abundantly confirmed, and settled beyond all further doubt or question. In fact, the navigation of the lake in boats is not a new thing—it having been previously done by an Irishman, Costigan, and more recently by an Englishman, Lieutenant Molyneux, of H.M.S. Spartan. Indeed, the latter officer had also performed the same passage down the Jordan; and had he lived to impart to the public the fruit of his observations, the interest of the present Expedition would have been forestalled, and its facts anticipated at all points. It is to the credit of Lieutenant Lynch that he manifests a full consciousness of the claims of his predecessors. He even gives the name of Point Costigan to one of the points of the peninsula, towards the south of the Dead Sea, and of Point Molyneux to the other; and it is certainly not the least of our obligations to these officers, that their prior claims, in all probability, prevented these spots from being ornamented with the names of Fanny Mason and Fanny Skinner, if not of Uncle Sam. It is bad enough as it is, to see an ancient and a sacred soil thus desecrated with any modern and Frankish names. Dr. Robinson would have ascertained the native names of those places; and our explorers might, if they had chosen, have done the same, by the aid of so accomplished and excellent an interpreter as Mr. Ameuny. We hope this sort of folly will end here. It is quite enough that the geographical nomenclature of half the world is ruined by this frightful bad taste, without the sacred land itself being exposed to the same deep abasement.

The Expedition spent no less than twenty-two nights upon the lake. During this time the whole circuit of it was made, including the back-water at the southern extremity, which had

never before been explored in boats. Every object of interest upon the banks was examined; and the lake was crossed and recrossed in a zigzag direction through its whole extent, for the purpose of sounding. The figure of the lake, as laid down in the sketch-map, is somewhat different from that usually given to it. The breadth is more uniform throughout; it is less narrowed at the northern extremity, and less widened on approaching the peninsula in the south. In its general dimensions it is longer, but is not so wide as usually represented. Its length by the map is forty miles, by an average breadth of about nine miles. The observations and facts from day to day are recorded in Lieutenant Lynch's book; and it is by reading them that the reader must realize the impressions which the survey is designed to produce, for the author does not take the trouble to combine his results in one clear and connected statement; indeed, the want of these occasional generalizations of details, which the reader of such a work is entitled to expect, and which, it might be thought, might have been easily given as a general retrospect of the whole, is the great defect of the book. Dr. Robinson, in his really great work on Palestine, after giving the details of his explorations, pauses on every vantage-ground to survey the scene, and to state the general effect and character of the whole. But nothing of the kind is attempted by our author, who seems to have been either ignorant of this necessity, or to have lacked the skill to supply it. The sea-custom of keeping an account of minute particulars and observations from day to day in the log-book, tends to create a habit of correctly observing and registering small details, but is perhaps unfavourable to the formation or cultivation of the faculty of generalization. On the other hand, there are men who can only

“ See things in the gross,
Being much too gross to see them in detail.”

One of this sort is Montague's sailor, who, being incapable of following the observations of his commander, and being, as it seems, only partially acquainted with other than the most obvious results, states general impressions rather than particulars; and we are not sure but that in this way he renders to the common reader the general effect of the whole much more effectively than his commander, whose account alone is, however, here of any scientific value. It has seemed to us, indeed, that this part of Montague's book is better done than any other. He here makes a most distinct impression, and, but for the egregious blunders into which he falls whenever stating what men know from *reading*, we might suppose that in this portion of the work he had access to better information than in other parts. This

writer does not lack power of observation; and his errors are mostly in those allusions to "things in general," in which only a man possessed of assured knowledge from reading and study, can be always correct. We are not sure that the blunders made in allusions of this sort—which are as plenty as blackberries—and the disgust one feels at the vile slang which turns up every now and then, tends to create an under-estimate of the truthfulness of many observations on matters that fall within the fair scope of an intelligent seaman's knowledge.

The only passage in which Lieutenant Lynch attempts to furnish us with something like the result of his exploration is this:—

"We have carefully sounded the sea, determined its geographical position, taken the exact topography of its shores, ascertained the temperature, width, depth, and velocity of its tributaries, collected specimens of every kind, and noted the winds, currents, changes of the weather, and all atmospheric phenomena. These, with a faithful narrative of events, will give a correct idea of this wonderful body of water as it appeared to us.

"From the summit of these cliffs, in a line a little north of west, about sixteen miles distant, is Hebron, a short distance from which Dr. Robinson found the dividing ridge between the Mediterranean and this sea. From Beni Na'im, the reputed tomb of Lot, upon that ridge, it is supposed that Abraham looked 'toward all the land of the plain,' and beheld the smoke 'as the smoke of a furnace.' The inference from the Bible, that this entire chasm was a plain sunk and 'overwhelmed' by the wrath of God, seems to be sustained by the extraordinary character of our soundings. The bottom of this sea consists of two submerged plains, an elevated and a depressed one; the last averaging thirteen, the former about *thirteen hundred* feet below the surface. Through the northern, and largest and deepest one, in a line corresponding with the bed of the Jordan, is a ravine, which again seems to correspond with the Wady el-Jeib, or ravine within a ravine, at the south end of the sea.

"Between the Jabok and this sea, we unexpectedly found a sudden break down in the bed of the Jordan. If there be a similar break in the water-courses to the south of the sea, accompanied with like volcanic characters, there can scarce be a doubt that the whole Ghor has sunk from some extraordinary convulsion, preceded, most probably, by an eruption of fire, and a general conflagration of the bitumen which abounded in the plain. I shall ever regret that we were not authorized to explore the southern Ghor to the Red Sea.

"All our observations have impressed me forcibly with the conviction that the mountains are older than the sea. Had their relative levels been the same at first, the torrents would have worn their beds in a gradual and correlative slope; whereas, in the northern section, the part supposed to have been so deeply engulfed, although a soft, bituminous limestone prevails, the torrents plunge down several hundred feet, while on both sides of the southern portion the ravines come

down without abruptness, although the head of Wady Kerak is more than a thousand feet higher than the head of Wady Gluweir. Most of the ravines, too—as reference to the map will show—have a southward inclination near their outlets; that of Zerka Main or Callirohoe especially, which, next to the Jordan, must pour down the greatest volume of water in the rainy season. But even if they had not that deflection, the argument which has been based on this supposition would be untenable; for tributaries, like all other streams, seek the greatest declivities, without regard to angular inclination. The Yermak flows into the Jordan at a right angle, and the Jabok with an acute one to its descending course.

“There are many other things tending to the same conclusion; among them the isolation of the mountain of Usdum; its difference of contour and of range, and its consisting entirely of a volcanic product.

“But it is for the learned to comment on the facts we have laboriously collected. Upon ourselves the result is a decided one. We entered upon this sea with conflicting opinions. One of the party was sceptical, and another, I believe, a professed unbeliever of the Mosaic account. After twenty-two days’ close investigation, if I am not mistaken, we are unanimous in the conviction of the truth of the Scriptural account of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain. I record with diffidence the conclusions we have reached, simply as a protest against the shallow deductions of would-be-unbelievers.”—Pp. 378-380.

As we have chosen a way of our own in which to state some of the other results of this exploration, we must hasten to complete the historical notice of its incidents, by stating, that before quitting the shores of the Dead Sea, the party made an excursion to Kerak, with the view principally of affording the men an intermediate refreshment from the close atmosphere of the lake. Here there are about 1000 Christians kept in most oppressive subjection by about one-third of the number of Moslem Arabs, who live mostly in tents outside the town. They have commenced building a church in the hope of keeping all together, and as a safe place of refuge for their wives and children in times of trouble; but the locusts and the sirocco have for the last seven years blasted the fields, and nearly all spared by these distractions has been swept away by the Arabs. They furnished the party with the subjoined appeal to the Christians in America, and which deserves to be known in this country.

“By God’s favour!

“May it, God willing, reach America, and be presented to our Christian brothers, whose happiness may the Almighty God preserve! Amen.

“8642.

“BEDUARI.

“We are, in Kerak, a few very poor Christians, and are building a church.

"We beg your Excellency to help us in this undertaking, for we are very weak.

"The land has been unproductive, and visited by the locust for the last seven years.

"The church is delayed in not being accomplished for want of funds, for we are a few Christians surrounded by Muslims.

"This being all that is necessary to write to you, Christian brothers of America, we need say no more.

"The trustees in your bounty.

"*ABD' ALLAH EN NAHAS*, Sheikh.

"*YÂKÔB EN NAHAS*, Sheikh's brother.

"*Kerak, Jâmad Awâh, 1264.*"

These poor people behaved very well, as they always do, to our travellers: but from the Arabs of Kerak they were, on their return, threatened with much danger—with greater danger, indeed, than had previously been known. But this and all dangers passed, and the survey of the lake being soon after completed, the boats, no longer needed, were taken to pieces, and sent, with two camels' load of specimens, to Jerusalem, whither the party itself followed by the route of Santa Saba. After some stay there they crossed the country to Jaffa. Nor was this without object or labour, a line of levels having to be carried, with the spirit level of the most recent and improved construction, (Troughton's,) from the chasm of the Dead Sea, through the desert of Jordan, "over precipices and mountain ridges, and down and across yawning ravines, and for much of the time under a scorching sun." The merit of this operation is assigned to Lieutenant Dale. The results are not stated, but are said to be confirmatory of the skill and extraordinary accuracy of the triangulation by Lieutenant Symonds.

At Acre the party divided, one portion proceeding in a Turkish brig to Beirut, and the other returning across the country to Tiberias, by way of Nazareth. The object being from hence to follow the Upper Jordan to its source, our interest in the special objects of the Expedition is revived. This part of the business is, however, passed but lightly over, there being no very new or very adventurous work to execute, and, as it seems to us, the officers being but ill-informed as to the points which in this part specially demanded attention.

In his way up the shore of the lake of Galilee, Lieutenant Lynch very modestly expresses an opinion in favour of Tell Hum as the probable site of Capernaum, in preference to Dr. Robinson's Khan Minryeh; and his return to the old ways we hail as a proof of his sound judgment. In respect of Bethsaida he is less fortunate, confounding the north-east Bethsaida with the western Bethsaida as the city of Andrew and Peter. But mis-

takes of this sort swarm throughout the work. The chances being only a degree or two less in this work than in Montague's that we encounter a blunder in connexion with every proper name that turns up.* Between the two lakes the river hastens—a rapid and foaming stream, between a thick border of willows, oleanders, and ghurrah. Of the lake Huleh nothing is added to our previous information, indeed, scarcely any thing is said; and we are quite distressed to say that the commander does not seem to have been at all aware that it was an object of interest to ascertain whether the river from Hasboiya, which, as the remoter source, must be regarded as the true Jordan, unites with the river from Banias before it enters the lake Huleh, or else reaches it as a separate and parallel stream. Not a word is said on this point, and there is no map or plan that might indicate the view taken of the matter.

The sources of the Jordan have been so often visited, and are so well known, that we could hardly expect much that is new on the subject. We certainly do not find any thing that was not previously well known. Upon the whole, this exploration of the Upper Jordan is a failure altogether. But this is excusable from the unbent attention of men whose energies had of late been greatly over-tasked, and who regarded the great objects of their undertaking as already accomplished.

The party proceeded to Damascus, and returned by way of Baalbek to Beirut. It was with dismay that it was found the Supply had not, according to appointment, arrived there to receive them—the rather as Mr. Dale and some of the men became sick, and needed medical assistance. In a few days, however, they all recovered except that able officer, who, after lingering a few weeks, died of the same low nervous fever which had carried off Costigan and Molyneux—the former explorers of the Dead Sea. He died at a village twelve miles up the Lebanon, to which he had withdrawn, in the hope of being invigorated by the mountain air. The afflicted commander deter-

* We note a few specimens. It is "Collingwood," and not Jarvis, who is described as breaking the enemy's line at Cape St. Vincent. The prophet "Isaiah," and not Elijah, as resting under the juniper-tree in the wilderness. Reland is throughout "Reylaud." "The Arab has no name for wine, the original Arabic word for which is now applied to coffee!" The truth being, that one of many Arabic words for wine is so applied. "J. Robinson, D.D., of New York," for F. Robinson, D.D. "The Chinese Kotan" for "Kotou." "Almeidan" for "Atmaidan." "We saw the river Cayster (*modern Meander*!)" "Acre derived its name from the church of St. Jean d'Acre." "Saul and his three sons throw themselves upon their swords." "Near the palace [of Boschiktascho on the Bosphorus] stood the column of Simeon and Daniel Stylites, two saintly fools, who spent most of their lives upon its summit." Simeon was never near the Bosphorus. But enough of this.

mined to take the body home, if possible, immediately started with it to Beirut. "It was a slow, dreary ride, down the rugged mountain by twilight. As I followed the body of my late companion, accompanied only by worthy Arabs, and thought of his young and helpless children, I could scarce repress the wish that I had been taken and he been spared." The body was, however, not taken home, but was deposited, "amid unhidden tears and stifled sobs," in the Frank cemetery at Beirut.

There is much reason to apprehend that the report of the results of this Expedition has suffered much from the loss of this accomplished officer. We see from a paper by Dr. Robinson in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for November 1848, that *he* anticipated this would be the case. He states,—

"Lieutenant Dale had reached the age of thirty-five; he was a man of fine appearance and elegant manners, and was selected by Lieutenant Lynch to be his companion because of his experience in the exploring expedition under Captain Wilkes, and as an engineer, first in connexion with the coast survey, and afterwards in Florida. His loss will doubtless be greatly felt in making up the report of the Expedition, the end of which he was permitted to behold, but not to participate its fruits, nor to enjoy its rewards."

We grieve to add, from the Preface of the volume before us,—
"His wife has since followed him to the grave; but in his name he has left a rich inheritance to his children." These are sad words, when we recollect the shortness of the interval between the return of the Expedition and the appearance of this statement.

About a week after, being a full month after the return to Beirut, the party embarked on board a French brig for Malta, being tired of waiting longer for the Supply. At Malta they were joined by that vessel on the 12th September, and re-embarking in her, sped homeward, reaching New York early in December, after an absence of something above one year.

Having thus traced the course of the Expedition, we must return to offer the reader some remarks upon the Dead Sea, in connexion with those researches concerning it which this American Expedition may be regarded as having consummated.

The name of "Dead Sea" is not known in Scripture, in which it is mentioned by the various names of the East Sea, the Sea of Sodom, the Sea of the Desert, and the Salt Sea. In Josephus and the classical writers, it is known by the name of the Lake of Asphaltites, from the great quantities of bitumen it produced. Its current name doubtless originated in the belief that no living thing could subsist in its waters. In the incidental allusions to it in the Old Testament—for it is not named in the New—there is nothing to suggest a foundation for the statements which have since been disproved; and all recent research confirms the Scrip-

tural intimations. We no sooner, however, get out of the Bible into the Apocrypha, than we are in the region of exaggeration and tradition. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon, speaking of the cities of the plain, says—"Of whose wickedness even to this day the waste land that smoketh is a testimony, and plants bearing fruits that never come to ripeness; and a standing pillar of salt is a monument of an unbelieving soul."—x. 7. Here are three points,—smoke rising from the lake; plants whose fruits will not ripen in this atmosphere; and the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was turned.

Now it must be confessed that this smoke was a very suitable incident for the imagination to rest upon. It was in keeping. It agreed with the doom in which at least the southern gulf of the lake originated, and suggested that the fires then kindled, and by which the guilty cities were consumed, still smouldered in the depths or upon the shores of the Asphaltic Lake. This smoke, however, turns out to be no other than the dense mist from the active evaporation going on upon the surface, which often overhangs the lake in the morning, and is only dissipated as the sun waxes hot. This is frequently mentioned by our expeditionists. It is seen not exclusively in the morning:—

"At one time to-day, the sea assumed an aspect peculiarly sombre. Unstirred by the wind, it lay smooth and unruffled as an inland lake. The great evaporation enclosed it in a thin transparent vapour, its purple tinge contrasting strongly with the extraordinary colour of the sea beneath, and where they blended in the distance, giving it the appearance of smoke from burning sulphur. It seemed a vast caldron of metal, fused but motionless."—P. 324.

The idea of fire, which is connected with that of smoke, may in part also have originated in the intensely phosphorescent character of these heavy waters by night. We are not certain that this has been noticed by any other than the present travellers.

"The surface of the sea," says Lieutenant Lynch, "was one wide sheet of phosphorescent foam, and the waves, as they broke upon the shore, threw a sepulchral light upon the dead bushes and scattered fragments of rock."

Then there are the fruits which will not ripen. It is evident that there are many plants to which the saline exhalations and intense heat of the deep basin of the Dead Sea must be ungenial, and which will therefore scarcely bring forth fruit to perfection; but there are others with which these conditions agree well, and which will there yield their fruits. There is not much evidence on this subject to be found in travellers, who have seldom been there in the season of fruit. But our expeditionists found divers kinds of plants and shrubs in vigorous blossom, and which

might therefore be expected to yield their fruits in due season. However, the general character of the shores is dismal, from the general absence of vegetation except at particular spots; and it must be admitted that the exhalations and saline deposits are as unfriendly to vegetable life as the waters are to animal existence.

We suspect, however, that the writer of Wisdom had in view those same famous apples of Sodom, of which Josephus speaks as of a peculiar product of the shores of this lake. "These fruits," says Josephus, "have a colour as if they were fit to be eaten; but if you pluck them with your hands, they dissolve into smoke and ashes." So Tacitus: "The herbage may spring up, and the trees may put forth their blossoms, they may even attain the usual appearance of maturity, but with this florid outside, all within turns black, and moulders into dust." This plant has of course been much sought after by travellers. Hasselquist and others thought it the fruit of the *Solanum melongena* or egg-plant, which is abundant in this quarter, but which only exhibits the required characteristics when attacked by insects. But since Seetzen and Irby and Mangles, there has been no question that the renowned "apple of Sodom" is no other than the *Osher* of the Arabs, the *Asclepias procera* of the early writers, but now forming part of the genus *Callotropis*. Dr. Robinson gives a good account of it: and our expeditionists add nothing to the information already possessed concerning it. The plant is a perennial, specimens of which have been found from ten to fifteen feet high, and seven or eight feet in girth. It is a gray, cork-like bark, with long oval leaves. The fruit resembles a large smooth apple or orange, and when ripe is of a yellow colour. It is even fair to the eye, and soft to the touch, but when pressed, it explodes with a puff, leaving in the hand only the shreds of the rind and a few fibres. It is indeed chiefly filled with air-like a bladder, which gives it the round form, while in the centre is a pod, containing a quantity of fine silk with seeds. When green, the fruit, like the leaves and the bark, affords, when cut or broken, a viscous, white milky fluid, called by the Arabs *Osher-milk*, (*Leben-osher*), and regarded by them as a cure for barrenness. This plant, however, which from being in Palestine found only on the shores of the Dead Sea, was locally regarded as being the special and characteristic product of that lake, is produced also in Nubia, Arabia, and Persia; which at once breaks up this one of the mysteries of the Dead Sea. It is no doubt found on those shores from the climate being here warmer, and therefore more congenial to it than in any other part of Palestine.

As to the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was turned, the existence of which has been recorded by many traditions, and of

which so many travellers have heard vague reports from the natives; it is one of the most remarkable discoveries of our Expedition, that *a* pillar of salt does exist, which is, without doubt, that to which the native reports refer, and which, or one like which, may have formed the basis of the old traditions. That this pillar, or any like it, is or was that into which Lot's wife was turned, is another question, which it is not needful here to discuss. The word rendered "a pillar," denotes generally any fixed object; and that rendered "salt," denotes also bitumen; and the plain significancy of the text would therefore seem to be, that she was slain by the fire and smoke, and sulphureous vapour; and her body being pervaded and enveloped by the bituminous and saline particles, lay there a stiffened and shapeless mass. The text appears to mean no more; but whether this mass may not have formed the nucleus of a mound, or even of a pillar of the same substance, forming as it were the unhonoured grave of this unbelieving woman, is a question we are not called upon to consider. If the text required us to understand literally "a pillar of salt," we should know that it existed, and should think it likely that it exists still, and the question would be whether this, which our travellers have found, is that pillar or not. We should probably think *not*; for although its place is in what must have been the general locality of this visitation, yet if Zoar, to which the fugitives were escaping, has been correctly identified (as we doubt not) in Zuweirah, it is difficult to find *this* place for the pillar, upon the route thereto, from any spot which Sodom can be supposed to have occupied. Besides this pillar is upon a hill, whereas the visitation evidently befell Lot's wife in the plain. The following is the account of it which Lieutenant Lynch gives:—

"To our astonishment, we saw, on the eastern side of Usdum, one-third the distance from its north extreme, a lofty, round pillar, standing apparently detached from the general mass, at the head of a deep, narrow, and abrupt chasm. We immediately pulled in for the shore, and Dr. Anderson and I went up and examined it. The beach was a soft, slimy mud, encrusted with salt, and a short distance from the water, covered with saline fragments, and flakes of bitumen. We found the pillar to be of solid salt, capped with carbonate of lime, cylindrical in front, and pyramidal behind. The upper or rounded part is about forty feet high, resting on a kind of oval pedestal, from forty to sixty feet above the level of the sea. It slightly decreases in size upwards, crumbles at the top, and is one entire mass of crystallization. A prop or buttress connects it with the mountain behind, and the whole is covered with debris of a light stone colour. Its peculiar shape is attributable to the action of the winter rains. The Arabs had told us in vague terms, that there was to be found a pillar somewhere upon the shores of the sea,

but their statements in all other respects had proved so unsatisfactory, that we could place no reliance on them."

Not a word is here said respecting the connexion of this pillar with Lot's wife; but in a note it is pointed out that "a similar pillar is mentioned by Josephus, who expresses his belief of its being the identical one into which Lot's wife had been transformed." This is cautious and judicious. Montagu's sailor, however, to whom this sort of thing was specially suited, speaks with less reserve; and we remember that this portion of his book had a run through the press in the United States, having been communicated by the publishers before the work appeared. It was well chosen for the purpose of exciting the curiosity of the public for the disclosures the book was to contain. After a somewhat bald description of the pillar, the writer proceeds, and informs us that it was sixty feet high and forty feet in circumference. He then goes on:—

"We cannot suppose that Lot's wife was a person so large that her dimensions equalled that of the column. Many think that the statue of Lot's wife was equal to the pillar of salt which the Bible speaks of, let that pillar be whatever it may, and whatever its size. They will not probably credit that this is the pillar; their preconceived notions have much to do with the matter; and they would have everybody—Americans and Syrians alike—think she was at once transformed into a column of very fine grained, beautifully *white* salt, about five feet or a few inches in height, and in circumference that of a middle-aged woman of the nineteenth century. Be that as it may, no two minds have, perhaps, formed exactly the same opinion on this matter who have not visited the spot. But here we are, around this immense column, and we find that it is really of solid rock-salt, one mass of crystallization. It is in the vicinity which is pointed out in the Bible in relation to the matter in question, and it appears to be the only one of its kind here; and the Arabs of the district, to [by] whom this pillar is pointed out as being that of Lot's wife, [must believe this to be] the identical pillar of salt to which the Bible has reference; the tradition having been handed down from each succeeding generation to their children, as the Americans will hand down to succeeding generations the tradition of Bunker's Hill Monument in Boston. My own opinion on the matter is, that Lot's wife having lingered behind, in disobedience to God's express command, given in order to ensure her safety; that, while so lingering, she became overwhelmed in the descending fluid, and formed the model or foundation for this extraordinary column. If it be produced by common, by natural causes, it is but right to suppose that others might be found of a similar description. One is scarcely able to abandon the idea that it stands here as a lasting memorial of God's punishing a most deliberate act of disobedience, committed at a time when he was about to show distinguishing regard for the very person."—Pp. 201, 202.

We were almost prepared to expect that this writer would shine among those who profess to have seen below the waters the ruins of the submerged cities. Even he, however, does not go to this extent; but, instead, he treats us with a very elaborate picture of the great scene of their destruction, all the outlines of which are amusingly filled up with details which could only be true of New York, or of some other great cities invested with all the circumstances of modern art and civilisation.

Among the other traditions of the lake are those which speak of the peculiar density and saline qualities of the waters; that, from the buoyancy imparted to them by this density, bodies could not sink in them; that, from the ingredients they hold in solution, no animal life could exist in these waters; and that, from the pestiferous effluvia, no birds are found near the lake, and that such as attempt to fly across fall dead upon the surface.

As to the density of the waters, it is said by Josephus that Vespasian tried the experiment of tying the hands of some criminals behind their backs, and throwing them into the lake, when they floated like corks upon the surface. This was, it must be admitted, not a very sagacious experiment, the position of the hands behind the back, whereby the dangerous weight of the arms is supported by the water, being the most favourable to floating safely in *any* waters. This, therefore, could not prove that bodies would not sink; yet being thought to prove that, or to have been intended to prove it, Dr. Pococke's assurance that he not only swam but *dived* in the water, was thought to shew either that the experiment had not been correctly stated, or that the water had, in the course of ages, become more diluted than at the time the experiment was made. This, indeed, is one of the points in which tradition has not erred. From the impregnation of saline and bituminous matters, this water is greatly heavier than that of the ocean. This has been shewn by many travellers for a hundred and fifty years past, and scarcely needs the confirmation which our explorers afford. Their long stay on the lake enabled them, however, to put together a greater number of *practical* illustrations of the fact. We will put a few of them together from both books. Some of the particulars almost suggest the idea of a sea of molten metal, still fluid, though cold. The sailor, who took his share in rowing, is most sensible of one of the effects which his commander less notices—the unusual resistance of the waves to the progress of the boat, and the force of their concussion against it. There was a storm of wind when the lake was first entered; and, says this writer, “the waves, dashing with fury against the boat, reminded its bold navigators of the sound and force of some immense sledge-hammers, when wielded by a Herculean power.” Again, he dwells on “the

extraordinary buoyancy of the waters, from the fact of our boats floating considerably higher than on the Jordan, with the same weight in them; and the greater weightiness of the water, from the terrible blows which the opposing waves dealt upon the advancing prows of the boat." There was another circumstance resulting from this density, noticed by the commander, that when the sea rolled, the boats took in much water from the crests of the waves circling over the sides. Before quitting the lake, Lieutenant Lynch

"Tried the relative density of the water of this sea and of the Atlantic; the latter from 25 deg. N. latitude and 52 deg. W. longitude; distilled water being as 1. The water of the Atlantic was 1.02, and of this sea 1.13. The last dissolved $\frac{1}{11}$; the water of the Atlantic $\frac{1}{8}$; and distilled water $\frac{1}{7}$ of its weight of salt; the salt used was a little damp. On leaving the Jordan, we carefully noted the draught of the boats. With the same loads they drew one inch less water when afloat upon this sea than in the river."—P. 377.

Of the experiments in bathing, little is added to those erewhile so graphically recorded by Mr. Stephens in his *Incidents of Travels*. We suspect, indeed, that Mr. Montague has drawn somewhat upon the pages of that lively traveller. Stephens says, "It was ludicrous to see one of the horses. As soon as his body touched the water he was afloat, and turned over on his side; he struggled with all his force to preserve his equilibrium, but the moment he stopped moving he turned over on his side, and almost on his back, kicking his feet out of water, and snorting with terror." This is closely imitated by Montague, who writes, "An experiment with an ass and a horse was also made. They were separately led into the sea, and when the water came in contact with the body of the animals, it was found heavier than the body itself, and consequently supported it upon the surface. The legs of the animals being rendered useless, were brought upon the surface, and they were thrown upon their side, plunging and snorting, puzzled by their novel position."—P. 219. Now, Lieutenant Lynch, in reporting the same experiment, expressly says, that the animals were *not* turned on their sides; and he is at a loss to account for Stephens' statement, but by supposing that the animal was in *that* case unusually weak. He admits, indeed, "that the animals turned a little on one side," but adds, that "they did not lose their balance." A similar experiment was made at another time with a horse, which "could with difficulty keep itself upright." In bathing himself, the commander says, "With great difficulty I kept my feet down; and when I laid [lay] upon my back, and drawing up my knees placed my hands upon them, I rolled immediately over." We fancy that we should have "rolled over" in any water, or even

on land, in making that experiment. But, however, the buoyancy of this water is unquestionable; and it is clear that both man and beast may not only roll over, but roll over with impunity upon it. So in Montague's book we read—

“Most of the men have bathed in its waters, and found them remarkably buoyant, so that they float with perfect ease upon it, and could pick a chicken, or read a newspaper at pleasure while so floating; in fact, it was difficult to get below the surface.”

These, certainly, are rather luxurious ideas for the Dead Sea—floating at ease, without fear of drowning, upon a soft water-bed, picking a chicken and reading a newspaper. Nevertheless, this like other luxuries has its penalties—for afterwards we read, “After being in it some few hours it takes off all the skin, and gives one the ‘miserables;’ on washing in it, it spreads over the body a disagreeable oily substance, with a prickly smarting sensation.” Again—“Another peculiarity was, that when the men's hands became wet with it in rowing, it produced a continual lather, and even the skin is oily and stiff, having a prickly sensation all over it.” Hence they washed with delight, when opportunities offered, in the fresh-water streams that came down to the sea.—P. 181.

“We had quite a task to wash from our skin all the uncomfortable substances which had clung to us from the Dead Sea, for our clothes and skin had become positively saturated with the salt water.”—P. 189.

But although thus unpleasant, acrid, and greasy, we are assured by Captain Lynch that the water is perfectly inodorous. And he ascribes the noxious smells which pervade the shores, not, as Molyneux supposed, to the lake itself, but to the fetid springs and marshes along the shore, increased perhaps by exhalations from the stagnant pools upon the flat plain, which bounds the lake to the north. Elsewhere, he contends, that the saline and inodorous exhalations from the lake itself must be rather wholesome than otherwise; and as there is but little verdure upon the shores, there can be no vegetable exhalations to render the air impure. The evil is in the dangerous and depressing influence from the intense heat, and from the acrid and clammy quality of the waters producing a most irritated state of the skin, and eventually febrile symptoms and great prostration of strength. Under these influences, in a fortnight, although the health of the men seemed substantially sound,

“The figure of each had assumed a dropsical appearance. The lean had become stout, and the stout almost corpulent; the pale faces had become florid, and those which were florid, ruddy; moreover, the slightest scratch festered, and the bodies of many of us

were covered with small pustules. The men complained bitterly of the irritation of their sores, whenever the acrid water of the sea touched them. Still, all had good appetites, and I hoped for the best."—*Lynch*, p. 336.

Remarkable effects are afforded by the saline deposits upon the shores. On the peninsula towards the south end,

"There are few bushes, their stems partly buried in the water, and their leafless branches incrustated with salt, which sparkled as trees do at home when the sun shines upon them after a heavy sleet."—*Lynch*, p. 298.

"Overhauled the copper boat, which wore away rapidly in this living sea. Such was the action of the fluid upon the metal, that the latter, so long as it was exposed to its immediate friction, was as bright as burnished gold, but when it came in contact with the air, it corroded immediately."—*Lynch*, p. 344.

"The shores of the beach before me, as I write, are incrustated with salt, and looked exactly as if white-washed."—*Lynch*, p. 344.

"The sands are not so bright as those of the Mediterranean and Atlantic Oceans, but of a darkish brown colour, and have the same taste as the sea-water, although it seldom distributes its waves over them."—*Montague*, p. 186.

"We noticed, after landing at Usdum, that, in the space of an hour, our very foot-prints upon the beach were coated with crystallization."—*Montague*, p. 207.

"A book of a large octavo size, being dipped in the water, either by accident or otherwise, resisted every attempt made to dry it. I have subsequently seen it in the oven of the ship's galley on several occasions, but without any permanent effect."—*Montague*, p. 224.

Now, as to the non-existence of living things in the water. This tradition, and that respecting the buoyancy of the water, seem to be those alone that are fully true. That creatures from the fresh-water streams that pour into the lake should die in water so essentially different—so salt, so dense, so bitter—was to be expected; but that this condition of the water should be fatal to all animal existence—that it harboured no peculiar forms of life—seemed to require strong proof; and this has, we think, been now sufficiently afforded. This had been stated by other travellers; and being now confirmed by those who were three weeks upon the lake, may be treated as an established fact. No trace of piscatory or lower forms of aquatic life was in all that time seen in these waters. Some of the streams that run into the lake are salt.

"In the salt-water streams there are plenty of fish, which, when they are unfortunately carried into the Dead Sea by the stream, or caught in their own element by the experimentalist, and thrown into it, at once expire and float. The same experiment was made and re-

peated at the mouth of the Jordan, with ourselves, of fish which we caught there, and cast into the sea ; and nature, alike in both instances, immediately refused her life-supporting influence."—*Montague*, p. 223.

The commander himself cites a still more extraordinary fact. In a note at p. 377, he says,—

" Since our return, some of the water of the Dead Sea has been subjected to a powerful microscope, and no animalculæ or vestige of animal matter could be detected."

This experiment, and proper care to secure some of the water of the lake, reminds us of a curious passage in our favourite old French traveller, Nau, who seems to regard this interest in the lake as a characteristic of Protestantism :—

" Before I finish this chapter, I must not omit to mention one thing that surprised me much in my two journeys. In both there were in the company some heretic merchants, who all manifested a marked devotion for this Sea of Sodom, testifying an extraordinary gladness in beholding it, and filling a large number of bottles with its water, to carry home with them, as if it had been some precious relic. I am not well able to understand the reasons of their devotion, or why they burdened themselves with so much of this water, which is of wrath and vengeance, rather than with that of the Jordan, which is a water of mercy and salvation. In fact, these men declared that there was nothing in all the Holy Land which they had seen with so much gratification."—*Voyage Nouveau*, p. 384.

The scarcity of vegetation upon the bushes would account for the comparative absence of land birds from the lake ; and the absence of fishes and other aquatic creatures from the waters would sufficiently explain the absence of aquatic fowl. There is no doubt, for these causes, some scarcity of birds here as compared with other lakes. But the notion that the effluvia of the waters were fatal to birds that attempted to pass, has been disproved during the present century by a great accumulation of evidence, which our explorers have been enabled largely to confirm. In fact, though we have long ceased to have any doubts on this point, we feel somewhat surprised at the number and variety of birds that are mentioned as found upon the borders of the lake, as flying over it, or as skinning its surface. It is scarcely worth while to multiply instances of what almost every recent traveller has noticed. One instance is sufficient and conclusive, which is, that wild ducks were more than once seen floating at their ease on the surface of the lake. The tradition, now to be treated as obsolete, probably originated in the bodies of dead birds being found on the shore or upon the water. Such were indeed three times picked up by our travellers ; but Lieutenant Lynch feels

assured that they had perished from exhaustion, and not from any malaria of the sea. Montague thinks they had rather been shot in their flight, and adds the interesting fact, that they were in a good state of preservation, though they appeared to have been for some time in the water. The water, he adds, seems to have the quality of preserving whatever is cast into it. Specimens of wood found there were in an excellent state of preservation.

We now quit with reluctance a subject in which we feel very much interest. Lieutenant Lynch's book must be pronounced of great value, not only for the additions which it makes to our knowledge, but as the authentic record of an enterprise in the highest degree honourable to all the parties concerned. Our only regret is, that the author's avowed anxiety to occupy the book-market has prevented him from digesting his materials so carefully as the importance of the subject demanded, and has left inexcusable marks of haste, which should in any future edition be removed. Mr. Bentley is not, in this matter, altogether free from blame; for there are numerous persons in this country whose services would have removed most of the grosser errors by which the work is disfigured. As for the other book, what we have already said, we say once more:—It is a bushel of chaff, from which those who think it worth their while, and who have sufficient patience and skill, may contrive to extract a few grains of wheat.

- ART. IX.—1. *Eastern Europe and the Emperor Nicholas.* By the Author of “*Revelations of Russia*,” &c. 2 vols. London, 1846.
2. *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature des Slaves.* Par F. G. EICHHOFF. Paris, 1839.
3. *Dalmatia and Montenegro; with a Journey to Mostar in Herzegovina, and Remarks on the Slavonic Nations.* By Sir J. GARDNER WILKINSON, F.R.S. 2 vols. London, 1848.
4. *Panslavism and Germanism.* By Count VALERIAN KRASINSKI. London, 1848.
5. *Der Krieg in Ungarn; mit einer Geschichte der Serbischen und Croatischen Wirren.* Von OSKAR FODAL. Mannheim, 1849.

No one that has not worked much in the element of History can be aware of the immense importance of clearly keeping in view the differences of race that are discernible among the nations that inhabit different parts of the world. In practical politics it is certainly possible to push such ethnographical considerations too far, as, for example, in our own cant about Celt and Saxon, when Ireland is under discussion; but in speculative History, in questions relating to the past career and the future destinies of nations, it is only by a firm and efficient handling of this conception of our species as broken up into so many groups or masses, physiologically different to a certain extent, that any progress can be made, or any available conclusions accurately arrived at.

The NEGRO or African, with his black skin, woolly hair, and compressed elongated skull; the MONGOLIAN of Eastern Asia and America, with his olive complexion, broad and all but beardless face, oblique eyes, and square skull; and the CAUCASIAN of Western Asia and Europe, with his fair skin, oval face, full brow, and rounded skull;—such, as every school-boy knows, are the three great types or varieties into which naturalists have divided the inhabitants of our planet. Accepting this rough initial conception of a world peopled everywhere more or less completely with these three varieties of human beings or their combinations, the historian is able, in virtue of it, to announce one important fact at the very outset,—to wit, that, up to the present moment, the destinies of the species appear to have been carried forward almost exclusively by its Caucasian variety. In the broad field and long duration of Ethiopic or Negro life, only one native and spontaneous civilisation appears to have presented itself—that of the ancient and almost mythical kingdom of Meröe on the sources of the Nile. Mongolian humanity, on the other hand, if we except the two abortive beginnings of the native

Mexicans and Peruvians in America, has been able as yet to produce but one great civilisation—that of the Chinese and Japanese. With this Ethiopic retrogression, and this Mongolian uniformity, compare Caucasian progress, as exhibited in the splendid succession of distinct civilisations, from the ancient Egyptian to the recent Anglo-American, to which the Caucasian part of the species has given birth. Such, at least, is the Past ; as to the Future let no man speak !

His attention thus specially directed to the Caucasian section of mankind, the historian finds it farther necessary to break it also up into parts. Studying the physiological and philological differences observable within its field, he is able, in the first place, to separate it into two great families of nations, essentially distinct—the *Semitic* family, consisting of men having the Arabic physiognomy, and speaking a class of languages, of which the Arabic is the type ; and the *Indo-European* family, consisting of men having a less determinable cast of physiognomy, and speaking a class of languages, of which the Sanscrit is the type. The special geographical seat of the former, or Semitic branch of the Caucasian stock, is that part of Western Asia which lies between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea on the west, and the Tigris and Persian Gulf on the east ; these lands, together with adjacent portions of Africa, are occupied by Semitic peoples now, and have been occupied by them from time immemorial. The area over which the Indo-European branch of the Caucasian stock has extended itself is much larger, and the diversities of its several partitions or offshoots are much more marked and important. Schlosser, whose scheme on this subject is the best that we have seen, enumerates four leading subdivisions of the Indo-European family :—1. The Armenian race, whose seat is in the vicinity of the Caspian, and whose part in history has hitherto been small ; 2. The Scythian race, overspreading the vast regions of Eastern and North-Eastern Europe, and of Central Asia, to the confines of the Mongolian countries ; 3. The Pelagic race, diffused, in the remotest ages, through Asia Minor, the *Ægean* Islands, Greece, Italy, and other parts of Southern Europe ; and the mother-race of the great Greek and Roman peoples ; and 4. The Indo-Persic race proper, stretching in Asia from the Caspian to the Bay of Bengal ; and the parent, in the west, of the two great modern races, the Celts of Gaul, Britain, Spain, &c., and the Germans of central Europe and the Scandinavian peninsulas. All these races, scattered as they are geographically, and differing, as they do from each other in many important respects, are yet bound together by certain similarities that distinguish them in the mass from the Semitic branch of nations.

Mastering such current ethnographical distinctions as these,

the student of history ought to take care at the same time thoroughly to digest and appropriate the positive notion that is wrapped up in them,—to wit, that our species is not a huge collection of perfectly similar human beings, but an aggregation of a number of separate groups or masses, the men of which, though all agreeing in the grand characteristics of humanity, all the creatures of a common Father, and all the heirs of a common hope, have yet such subordinate differences of organization that, necessarily, they must understand nature differently, and employ in life very different modes of procedure. Assemble together a Negro, a Mongol, a Shemite, an Armenian, a Scythian, a Pelasgian, a Celt, and a German, and you will have before you not mere illustrations of an arbitrary classification, but positively distinct human beings, men whose relations to the outer world are by no means the same. In all, indeed, there will be found the same fundamental instincts and powers, the same obligation to recognised truth, the same feeling for the beautiful, the same abstract sense of justice, the same necessity of reverence; in all, the same liability to do wrong, knowing it to be wrong. These things excepted, however, what contrast, what variety! The representative of one race is haughty and eager to strike, that of another is meek and patient of injury; one has the gift of slow and continued perseverance, another can labour only at intervals and violently; one is full of mirth and humour, another walks as if life were a pain; one is so faithful and clear in perception, that what he sees to-day he will report accurately a year hence; through the head of another there perpetually sings such a buzz of fiction that, even as he looks, realities grow dim, and rocks, trees, and hills reel before his poetic gaze. Whether, with phrenologists, we call these differences craniological; or whether, in the spirit of a deeper physiology, we adjourn the question by refusing to connect them with aught less than the whole corporeal organism—bone, chest, limb, skin, muscle, and nerve; they are, at all events, real and substantial; and Englishmen will never conceive the world as it is, will never be intellectually its masters, until, realizing this as a fact, they shall remember that it is perfectly respectable to be an Assyrian, and that an Italian is not necessarily a rogue because he wears a moustache.

It is but a change of expression to say that races, whose individual specimens differ so much, must stand in very different relations to the general history of the world. While the Shemite, for example, whose mental characteristics are extreme spontaneity and ease, attained his highest perfection almost at once, and has since acted but fitfully on the general condition of the world, the Indo-European, on the other hand, with faculties more stubborn and more dependent on discipline, has advanced by successive

steps, and has charged himself specifically with that part of the entire business of the species which consists in continuous intellectual evolution. Thus, in Europe, civilisation as it now exists has been the progressive work of three great Indo-European races. First of all there was the Pelasgic movement, including the whole of Greek and Roman activity; to this succeeded the less ostensible Celtic movement, dating from the first conflicts of the Celts with the Roman Empire, and including the whole of Celtic activity as exhibited in the original formation and the subsequent history of the Romano-Celtic kingdoms of France, Spain, &c., in Western Europe; and lastly came the Teutonic or German movement, pursuing close on its predecessor, and filling Central and Northern Europe with Germanic kingdoms. At this hour, the more important half of Europe, that half which includes the five great civilized populations of the West, the French, the Spaniards, the Italians, the British, and the Germans, is a medley of Pelasgic, Celtic, and Teutonic elements. According to all analogy, however, it is not by mere continued action and fermentation among themselves that these elements will work out the final and most perfect condition of Indo-European life. The capacities, indeed, of the five great western nations are by no means yet exhausted, and for centuries to come they may still lead the van of human progress; but what instinct and experience alike teach is that sooner or later they must receive from without a new barbaric impulse. As the Celtic was superinduced upon the waning Pelasgic, and as the Teutonic came like a deluge upon both, so, even now, it appears, there must be waiting a new element ready to rush in upon civilized Europe when the hour shall require it. And where shall we look for this element if not to the great Scythian regions of Eastern Europe, where already something of the kind seems to be gathering? An Indo-European race, it is for the Scythians more than for any other still barbaric part of the species, to undertake the next stage in an evolution, all the previous stages of which have been achieved by Indo-European hands; and, situated on the eastern confines of the civilized confederacy of occidental nations, it is for them more than for any other population on the world's map to move next in a progress, the direction of which hitherto has uniformly been from east to west. Such, at least, is the historical conjecture of the day, the great speculation that lies concealed amid all the vague talk that has been going on regarding Russia, Eastern Europe, and the Slavonian nations.

Much confusion has been produced by the constant use in books of words denoting the supposed state of flux and restlessness in which the early nations of Europe lived. The natural impression, after reading such books, is, that masses of people

were continually coming out of Asia into Europe and driving others before them. So far, of course, this is true, and a clear view of the original colonization of Europe by immigrations from Asia would be a very important acquisition. But care must be taken to confine these stories of wholesale colonization to their proper place in the ante-historic age. For all intents and purposes it is best to conceive that at the dawn of the historic period the leading European races were arranged on the map pretty much as they are now. Regarding the Slavonians, at least, this has been established; they are not, as has generally been supposed, a recent accession out of the depths of Asia, but are as much an aboriginal race of Eastern, as the Germans are of Central Europe. In short, had a Roman geographer of the days of the Empire advanced in a straight line from the Atlantic to the Pacific, he would have traversed the exact succession of races that is to be met in the same route now. First, he would have found the Celts occupying as far as the Rhine; thence, eastward to the Vistula and the Carpathians, he would have found Germans; beyond them, and stretching away into Central Asia, he would have found the so-called Scythians—a race which, if he had possessed our information, he would have divided into the two great branches of the Slavonians or European Scythians, and the Tatars, Turks or Asiatic Scythians; and, finally, beyond these, he would have found Mongolian hordes overspreading Eastern Asia to the Pacific. These successive races or populations he would have found shading off into each other at their points of junction; he would have remarked also a general eastward pressure of the whole mass, tending towards mutual rupture and invasion, the Mongolians pressing against the Tatars, the Tatars against the Slavonians, the Slavonians against the Germans, and the Germans against the Celts.

The Slavonians, we have said, are an aboriginal European branch of the great Scythian race. Their specific name among the Greeks was *Έννετοι*, of which the Latin translation was *Venetæ*; their western neighbours, the Germans, called them *Wenden*; by the northern Scandinavians they were called the *Vanar*; the name by which they called themselves was *Serbi* or *Sirbi*. The name *Slavonians*, which has superseded all these, is of comparatively recent origin, and is derived either from the native word *slava*, meaning “glory,” or from the native word *slovo*, meaning “speech.” The original territories of these *Venetæ*, *Wenden*, *Serbi*, or *Slavonians*, were very extensive; Ptolemy (A.D. 140) speaks of them as an *ἔθνος μεγιστον*, and Procopius (A.D. 550) calls them a *natio populosa* dwelling *per immensa spatia*. The ancient Thracians, it is now concluded, were a Slavonic people, probably with Pelasgic intermixture:

the Dacians, the Mæsiens, and other populations living north of the Thracians, and ultimately included with them in the Roman Empire, were still more certainly of the Slavonic stock; and the Veneti of the Adriatic, an aboriginal Italian nation finally conquered by Cæsar, were, as the name implies, an extreme western outpost of the same great race. The chief seat of the Slavonians, however, was to the north of the Black Sea and the Carpathian mountains, and between the Baltic and the Volga. It is even likely that then, as now, their northern offshoots reached to the Icy Seas. Spreading over so vast an extent of territory, they must then, as now, have been by far the most numerous of the European races. At present the Germans of Europe are estimated at thirty-five millions, and the Slavonians at eighty millions; and it is considered probable that their original proportions were nearly the same.

The general description given by Herodotus of the manners of the ancient Scythians appears to apply partly to the Tatars or Scythians of Asia, but chiefly to the Slavonians; for in his enumeration of the Scythian nations he distinctly mentions many that must necessarily have been Slavonic. According to this description, the Slavonians were a race partly agricultural in their habits, but chiefly pastoral and nomadic, great horse-breeders and cattle-rearers, moving about along the banks of the rivers that flow into the Black Sea, the Caspian, and the Baltic. Coming down to later times, we find them advanced a stage. According to a manuscript quoted by Gibbon, there were, towards the close of the Roman period, no fewer than 4600 villages scattered over the future area of Russia and Poland, a fact indicating the pretty general exchange that had by that time taken place among the Slavonians, of the nomadic for the settled and industrial mode of life. Individually the Slavonians were tall and strongly made; their complexions, though swarthier than those of the Germans, were fairer than those of the Tatars or Mongols; their eyes were small and deeply sunk; their hair was dark or reddish, but not black. In their habits they were more dirty and slovenly than the Germans. In war they were brave, energetic, particularly successful in ambuscades, and, though ferocious in the moment of attack, much less cruel to their prisoners than any other people; in peace they were of hospitable and mild disposition, generally honest in their dealings, and faithful in their domestic relations. As among the Hindoos, it was the custom of their widows to burn themselves on the same pile with their deceased husbands; and altogether their women held an inferior position to that assigned to women among the Germans. They were fond of music; and their national instrument was the *gusla*, a kind of cithara or guitar with only one

string, played with a bow, and accompanying the voice, still the popular instrument in all Slavonic countries. Their government was by popular assemblies held in the open air, in which all full-grown men had a right to take part; slavery was unknown among them, and even foreign captives were after a certain time admitted to civil rights. Among no people, it would appear, was despotic individual power more repugnant to the national spirit—a curious fact; when we consider the present condition of the Slavonic world. Their executive chiefs and dignitaries—such as the *Pan* or “lord,” the *Jupan* or “governor of a province,” the *Voyevoda* or “leader in war,” the *Boyar* or “fighter,” the *Knierz*, which is translated “count” or “prince,” and the *Kral* or “king”—appear all to have been originally elective. In religion they were Polytheists, with glimmerings of belief in one supreme Spirit. Their Pantheon, however, was not the same as that of the Germanic races. *Biel Bog*, or the “white god,” and *Cherni Bog*, the “black god,” represented as a lion, were their good and evil principles. Besides these, they worshipped *Perun*, the thunder-god; *Rugevit*, the war-god, represented with seven faces; *Porenut*, the god of seasons; *Radegast*, apparently the god of hospitality, represented as a naked man with the head of a lion, crowned by a bird; *Proven*, the god of justice; *Volos*, the god of flocks; *Koleda*, the god of festivals; and *Kupala*, the god of fruits, whose feast-day was on the 23d of June, a circumstance still commemorated among the Russians by the half-pagan name of St. John Kupala given to the saint whose fête falls on that day. One of the greatest deities of the Slavonians, however, was *Sviatovid*, or “Holy Sight,” whose chief shrine was in the island of Rügen. He was represented with two bodies and four heads; in one hand he held a bow, and in the other a horn, which was filled once every year with mead. To this god was consecrated a white horse, which none but the priest was allowed to feed or mount; and a saddle, bridle, and sword lay continually near the idol, that, when he chose, he might ride forth against the enemies of the Slavonians. At the annual festival held in his honour, the priest held up before the multitude the horn that the god had held in his hand, prognosticating the state of the future harvest from the quantity of last year’s mead that remained in it; then, pouring this out, he replenished the horn, replaced it in the hand of the god, and invited the people to eat and make merry. Wo to the Slavonian that did not get drunk on that day!

Extending over an area so vast, and presenting such varieties of climate, soil, neighbourhood, &c., it was inevitable that the great Slavonic mass should gradually fall asunder into fragments, distinguished from each other by peculiarities of feature, dialect, and customs. Three such spontaneous fragments appear very

early to have exhibited themselves—the northern Slavonians, the ancestors of the present Russians, inhabiting the countries immediately east of the Baltic, and having for their chief towns Novgorod on the Volkof, and Kiew on the Dnieper; the Central Slavonians, or Lekhs, the ancestors of the Poles, inhabiting all that tract of Eastern Europe that constituted Poland at its greatest extent, and having for their chief towns Arkona, Rügen, and Vineta at the mouth of the Oder; and the southern Slavonians or Tchekhes, the ancestors of the present Bohemians, Moravians, Slavonians of Hungary, &c., inhabiting the countries to the south of Prussia and Poland, and having for their chief town Prague. The memory of this primitive tendency of the great Slavonian family to separate itself spontaneously into three parts, in obedience to mere geographical causes, is still preserved in a Slavonian mythus, which tells how in remote ages the three brothers Russ, Lekh, and Tchekh, left the Illyrian mountains to found the three great States of Russia, Lekhia or Poland, and Tchekhia or Bohemia.

Had no foreign causes interfered, had the three Slavonian nationalities that were thus gradually forming themselves been allowed to arrive at maturity, uninfluenced by anything from without, we should then have witnessed in their history and their condition at the present hour, the spectacle of a free development of the Slavonian genius, in all its force and all its peculiarity. We should have seen, for example, in what form or forms of government, applicable to civilized states of large extent, the peculiar democratic spirit of the original Slavonians would in course of time have resulted. Fortunately, however, Providence does not work in this easy simple way, as if to illustrate Montesquieu. The Slavonian peoples were not left shut in by themselves to evolve a pure and peculiar civilisation by their own unaided energy; they were assailed, broken in upon, and disrupted by foreign elements and agencies, linking them with the rest of the world; and thus, though the Slavonian genius has developed itself, though in Eastern Europe at the present moment we have a state of things essentially and specially Slavonian, yet the result, as it now stands, is altogether more complex and extraordinary than could have been anticipated.

The division of the empire of the Cæsars into the two empires of the East and the West (A.D. 395) was an event of great importance to the Slavonian nations, seeing that, by their geographical position, they were thus placed exactly between two great sovereignties, and subjected to all the consequences that might arise from their disjunction. Nor were such consequences slow to manifest themselves. Hardly had the separation taken place when the German race of the Goths, who had already for

more than a century been advancing from their Scandinavian homes into the territories of the Central and Southern Slavonians, the lands of the Lekhs and Tchekhes, burst the restraints that had been imposed upon them by the prudence of former emperors, and marched under Alaric against the empire of the West—thus giving the signal for a general irruption to the other Germanic races. Towards the close of the fourth and during the early part of the fifth century, the Central and Southern Slavonians were but allies, subjects, and entertainers of the Goths, quartering and recruiting their armies as they passed on towards the West. Suddenly, however, a new race of invaders swept over the Slavonian plains. The Huns, that truly Mongolian or Calmuck people, whose long wanderings from the time (A.D. 90) at which they are known to have quitted their original settlements on the confines of China, till the time at which they emerged like a devastation on Eastern Europe, the historian can but vaguely conceive,—this race of swarthy, short, thick-set, hideous-looking men, already for some time settled in Eastern Russia, along the Volga, had at last advanced to the Danube, and were now preparing to follow as conquerors in the track of the tall and fair-skinned Goths. Nor even among them was a great leader wanting. It was in the year 433 that the Calmuck Napoleon, Attila, described as a diminutive, squat, broad-shouldered figure, with a large head, first announced himself to East and West as “the scourge of God.” Leading his Hunnish hordes in all directions over the Slavonian countries, he speedily made them his own, subduing both Germans and Slaves from the Baltic to the Black Sea, from the Rhine to the Volga. The Hunnish empire which he had established, however, fell to pieces at his death (453); and in the sixth and seventh century the only traces that remained of the terrible visitation of Europe by the Huns were to be found in the prevalence of people of Hunnish or Bulgarian descent in particular spots of the Slavonian region, and especially among the Tchekhes, part of whose territories became almost a Hunnish kingdom, under the name of Hungary. The troubles of the Slavonians, however, were by no means ended by the annihilation of Hunnish rule. Already considerably affected by Gothic and Hunnish influences, the Central and Southern Slavonians now found themselves exposed to the encroachments on the west of the various Germanic races, (Franks, Burgundians, Lombards, &c.,) who, having acted their part in the dissolution of the Western Empire, had by this time consolidated themselves in Western and Central Europe, and were ready to extend their dominion eastward along the Danube. Scarcely able to resist these western warriors, the Slavonians sought out a weaker foe, their victories over whom might

compensate for their losses by the stronger. The Empire of the East, daily becoming more feeble, was a tempting prey. Pouring southwards (A.D. 527) through the provinces of Mæsia and Thrace, into the Greek countries, the Slavonians threatened to enact the same part towards this Empire that the Germans had enacted towards the Empire of the West. Defeating the Imperial legions that were sent against them, they appeared before the walls of Constantinople; and it was only by the address of Belisarius that they were persuaded to quit that neighbourhood, and return to the banks of the Danube. For some time after this, the Greek Emperors were delivered from all fear of another Slavonian invasion by the appearance in the Slavonian territories themselves of a new enemy—the Avars or Avari, a Turkish or Tatar race, who, following the beaten route from Asia into Europe, seemed resolved to repeat on a smaller scale the grand enterprise of the Huns. No sooner, however, had the Avari become masters of Central and Southern Slavonia, than they, in turn, assailed the Byzantine Empire. Mingled armies of Avars and Slavonians ravaged its provinces, and menaced Constantinople. Jointly, they would doubtless have proved successful; it was therefore a matter of no small joy to the Greek Court, that at the very time when the danger was greatest (624,) efforts began to be made by the Slavonians to throw off the yoke of the Avars. The Slavonians of Bohemia were the first to rise; but, encouraged by their example, and stimulated by the Byzantine statesmen, the rest of the southern Slavonians made a bold attempt, and, recovering their own independence, at the same time served the interests of the Empire. To reward the Slavonians for this service, settlements were given them in various parts of the Greek dominions. One Slavonian tribe,—the Chrobati, descending from the Carpathians, and settling in parts of Illyria from which they had expelled the Avars, founded the state or nation of Croatia; other Slavonian tribes dispersing themselves over the whole tract of country south of Hungary that lies between the Adriatic and the Black Sea, formed the present Slavonian settlements of Servia, Bulgaria, Slavonia proper, and Dalmatia; while not a few bands of Slavonians were transferred as colonists even into Southern Greece and Asia Minor, where, absorbed into the native population, they contributed that Slavonian ingredient which philologists discover in the language of the modern as compared with that of the ancient Greeks.

The series of events which we have thus sketched, affected, it will be observed, chiefly the Central and Southern Slavonians, or, as we have already called them, the Lekhs and the Tchekhes. As regards the former, the general result of so much conquest and invasion was, that they suffered a social change; were trans-

mutated from a mere aggregation of perfectly free tribes into the two large nations of the Lithuanians and the Poles proper, each consisting of a vast population of serfs ruled over by a hereditary sovereign and a numerous caste of military nobles or free men. On the Tchekhes or Southern Slavonians, the general effect had been, as we have seen, still more remarkable. Territorially disrupted as well as socially changed by the successive conquests of the Germans, the Huns, and the Avars, they had gradually separated into two great masses—the western or Independent Tchekhes, divided into the subordinate denominations of Bohemians, Moravian, and Slovacks or Tchekhes of Hungary; and the Southern Tchekhes or Græco-Slavonians, subject to the Eastern Emperors, and divided into the subordinate denominations of Croats, Servians, Bulgarians, Slavonians proper, Dalmatians, &c. It is only to the former of these two masses that the name Tchekhes is now applied; and properly enough, when we consider that in the formation of the Græco-Slavonian colonies, the Lekkish Slavonians must have in some degree assisted. Finally, as regards the third of the great primitive fragments of the Slavonian race—the northern Slavonians or Russians, this nation, it will have been remarked, was exempted by its geographical position from much of the agitation that had so violently shaken its kindred populations, the Lekhs and the Tchekhes. Living peaceably, and plying trading occupations, of which they were fond, the tribes of Novgorod, Kiew, and their adjacencies, still retained unchanged their native Slavonian habits and characteristics. Even they, however, were doomed at last to foreign invasion. Huns and Avars had spared them, despising the conquest of their sunless and wintry lands; but the Northern Scandinavians, less difficult to please, now began to pay them marauding visits. At length, in the year 850, one Danish or Swedish chief, named Rurik, crossed the Baltic with a fleet, and making himself master of all the Slavonian countries of the Baltic, established himself at Novgorod, and founded the dynasty of the Grand Dukes of Muscovy, or Great Russia.

The Muscovites or Great Russians, extending from the Baltic inland as far as the Dwina and the Volga, and ruled over by a Scandinavian dynasty; the Lekhs or Poles, forming the two independent nations of Lithuania and Poland proper, governed by native dynasties, and extending from the Oder to the Dnieper, and from the Baltic to the Carpathian mountains; the Tchekhes or Slavonians of the three independent states or kingdoms of Bohemia, Moravia, and Hungary; and the medley of Græco-Slavonian nations, Croats, Servians, Bulgarians, Slavonians proper, Dalmatians, &c., attached to the Greek Empire—such, in the ninth century, were the four leading divisions of the Slavonic

family. A great change was produced in the condition of these four Slavonian masses individually, and in their mutual relations, by the introduction among them of Christianity. There were two quarters, it is evident, from which Christianity might reach the Slavonic nations—the Latin world on the west, spiritually subject to the Roman pontiffs; or the Greek world on the east, spiritually subject to the patriarchs of Constantinople. From both these quarters, Christianity did make its way. The Lekhs of Poland, and the Tchekhes of Bohemia, Moravia, and Hungary, received their religious forms chiefly from the West, (A.D. 700-1000,) and consequently became, for the most part, adherents of the Latin or Roman Catholic Church; the Græco-Slavonians, and the Muscovites or Great Russians, on the other hand, were converted chiefly by Greek missionaries, (A.D. 640-1100,) and consequently adopted, in preference, the rites and doctrines of the Greek Church. This fact is of great importance in its bearing on Slavonian history. The Poles, the Lithuanians, and the Tchekhes, for example, converted into adherents of the Romish faith, became by that very fact members of the great confederacy of the Western nations; while the Russians, the Bulgarians, &c., fell back, as it were, into the arms of the East. This distinction was perpetuated by certain corresponding differences in the written characters used by the two groups of peoples. At first, the Cyrillic alphabet, so called because it was devised from the Greek by a Greek monk, Cyril (873), was used, with the vernacular form of service, even in Bohemia and Moravia, where, indeed, Cyril preceded the Latin missionaries: ultimately, however, by the strenuous exertions of the Romish Church, the Latin character and the Latin form of service triumphed among all the Slavonian Romanists, with the exception of some Romanist communities among the Græco-Slavonians of the Adriatic, for whom an expressly new character was invented, called the Glagolitic, and who were allowed, besides, to retain their vernacular service. The use of the Cyrillic character, therefore, became a characteristic of the Slavonians of the Greek Church.

The two great influences between which, as between two opposite pressures, we have seen the Slavonian populations struggling and gradually moulding themselves from the fourth to the tenth century—to wit, the encroachments of the German powers on the west, and the indefatigable irruptions of the Asiatic race from the east, did not yet cease to operate. Let us briefly indicate the results of their continued action from the tenth century forward.

The Roman Empire of the west, disintegrated and overrun by the various Teutonic races, had at length (800) been re-united under the sceptre of the Frankish Charlemagne. But the pur-

pose of this Germanic reconstruction of the western world having been fully served, a new subdivision was required; and, in the year 843, the grandsons of Charlemagne effected such a subdivision by sharing among themselves the vast dominions of their ancestor. Gaul and the dominion of the western Franks were assigned to Charles the Bald; Lothaire, the eldest of the brothers, retained Italy and other central territories, together with the Imperial dignity; while Louis became master of Germany, *i.e.*, feudal chief of the confederate German States proper, beyond the Rhine.

The German Empire of Louis, in addition to some wine-growing districts on the left bank of the Rhine, comprehended on the right bank the German States or Duchies of Bavaria, Saxony, Franconia, and Swabia, together with some Slavonian dependencies, consisting chiefly of lands that had been conquered by Charlemagne from the Lekhs of Lithuania, and the Tchekhes of Bohemia. Powerful from the first, and rendered still more powerful by being converted (887) from a hereditary possession of the Carlovingian kings into a confederacy of free States under an elective head, the German Empire was able generally to extend its Slavonian appendages. Under Henry the Fowler, for example, who was Emperor from 919 to 936, the districts of Brandenburg and Lusatia were conquered from the Lekhs and the Tchekhes; and by his successors of the Saxon dynasty (936-1024) not only were new conquests added to these, extending the German frontier as far as the Oder, but the Slavonian dukes of Bohemia and Poland were reduced to the condition of tributaries. The more thoroughly to Germanize the Slavonian parts of the empire, German colonies were planted and German bishoprics established in them; and, indeed, it was chiefly by the rough-handed efforts of their German conquerors that the North-western Slavonians were first reclaimed from Paganism. To provide for the efficient government of this quarter of the German Empire, several margravates or marquises (literally earldoms of the marches) were erected; of which the two most important were the margravate of the North, otherwise called the margravate of Brandenburg, established on the frontier towards the Lekhs of Poland, and the margravate of the East, otherwise called the margravate of Austria, (*Oester-reich*, literally Eastern march,) established on the frontier towards the Tchekhes of Bohemia and Hungary. This latter margravate, though but a creation and outpost of the Germanic Empire, soon swelled itself to the dimensions of a great power, by assuming the chief burden of the activity of the empire against the Slavonians. Elevated into a Duchy by the Emperor Frederic I. (1152,) and still farther aggrandized when Rudolph of Haps-

burg, having been elected to the empire in 1273, assigned it as fief to his eldest son Albert, it gradually acquired, by marriage, inheritance, or conquest, (1273-1560,) dominion over Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, &c., thus absorbing into itself the whole of the Tchekkh portion of the Slavonian family. It was in consequence of this very extension of its rule by the annexation of Slavonian territories that Austria attained that predominance in the Germanic Empire which enabled it to retain the imperial dignity; so long as that dignity existed, in the possession of the House of Hapsburg. Meanwhile, what the margravate of Austria had been to the Tchekhes or Southern Slavonians, the margravate of Brandenburg had proved to their north-western brethren the Lekhs. Converted into an Electorate of the empire by the Golden Bull of Charles IV. in 1356, and acquired by purchase in 1417 by the House of Hohen-Zollern, this margravate was gradually enlarged by the abilities of its holders till it assumed the dimensions of the original Prussian kingdom. That kingdom, the creation of the successive Fredericks and Frederick-Williams of the House of Hohen-Zollern, is, in reality, but a well Germanized section of the territories of the Lekhs or central Slavonians. The name Prussia itself was originally but the designation of a Polish fief, added to the Electorate in 1618; and it was not till 1701 that the electors of Brandenburg, wishing a title more descriptive of their position as sovereigns of a joint population of Germans and Slavonians, assumed that of kings of Prussia.

While Germany was thus seizing the Slavonian races from the West by its two greedy arms Prussia and Austria, a more violent and stormy influence was agitating them from the East. Since the days of the Huns and the Avars, there had been a general tendency of the Asiatic races to dash themselves against the populations of Eastern Europe. One such Asiatic race, calling themselves the *Magyars*, and belonging not to the Calmuck or Mongolian family, as some have supposed, but to the Turkish or Tatar subdivision of the great Caucasian family, detached themselves about the year 880 from their Asiatic connexions, whatever those were, and advancing into Europe, under a chief named Arpad, took possession of a large tract of land in the very heart of the Tchekhes, and subjecting the native inhabitants to serfdom, founded the present Tatar-Slavonic kingdom of Hungary. The name Hungary itself, though imagined by some to have been an ancient name given to that section of the Tchekkh dominions, to denote its previous extensive colonization by the Huns or Calmucks, is by others regarded as a native Magyar appellation, given to what had till then been known only as a part of Great Moravia. In any case, the Magyars

were able almost instantly to naturalize themselves in the fine country which they had selected for their habitation. Under Geysa, the grandson of Arpad, they embraced Christianity, and thus entered within the pale of Catholic Europe. Stephen, the son of Geysa, assuming the title of King of Hungary, became known as a warlike potentate; and his successors following in his footsteps, added the Græco-Slavonian territories of Croatia (1100), Slavonia proper, Dalmatia and Servia, as well as part of Poland, to the dominion of the Magyars. The royal line of the Magyar chief Arpad, however, becoming extinct in 1301, the throne thus becoming elective, or, at least, passing from hand to hand, and other circumstances occurring to weaken the power of the Magyars, these Slavonian provinces were again separated from the Hungarian kingdom, which ultimately, as we have seen, became itself merged with Bohemia in the Arch-Duchy of Austria (1558).

The Magyar invasion of Eastern Europe, although its effects have been intense and permanent, was a movement of far less tremendous aspect than the invasion of the so-called *Moguls*, which took place about three centuries and a half later. These Moguls were, as the name implies, a branch of the great Mongolian family, and consequently kinsmen of the Huns. Roaming in the extreme east of Asia to the north and north-east of the Chinese wall, they were suddenly united into one great horde, or nation of irresistible power, under a native chief, named Temudgin, a man of true Mongol genius, with powers not inferior to those of his Hunnish prototype Attila. The conquest of the world, or at least of what he called the world, was the dream of this chieftain, and he all but realized it. Subduing first the other Mongolian hordes of Eastern Asia, such as the Calmucks, he next advanced among the Turkish or Tatar races of the west. The conquest of these brought him to the borders of Europe. Russia was the country most exposed to his attacks. Since the establishment among the northern Slavonians of the Scandinavian dynasty of Rurik (850), this country had been gradually forming itself. Divided into several principalities, under different branches of the family of Rurik, one of which usually held the supreme dignity, it had come, at length, to include, when considered as a whole, not only the original Muscovite or Great Russian populations of Novgorod, Kiew, &c., but also various other populations surrounding those or adjacent to them, to wit, the Fins, or Tchoudes of the north, an extreme western offshoot of the Mongolian family, whose tendency it seems to have been from the first to push itself completely round the Arctic circle; the Tatars of the Uralian mountains, and their neighbourhood; and towards the south, portions of the two Lekkish populations of

the white Russians, and the Ruthenians, Cossacks, or Little Russians, detached from the Lithuanian and Polish nations by encroachment and war, and differing very much in character from the timid and pacific Muscovites. Such was Russia, or rather such was Russia tending to become, when the hordes of the Mogul chief Temudgin, or, as he now called himself, *Tchinghis Khan*, (i.e., most great ruler,) appeared on its frontier. Under the generals of Tchinghis they overran and thoroughly subdued the whole country, reducing its Scandinavian princes to the condition of vassals and tributaries. Nor was Russia the only country in Europe that suffered from this Mogul invasion. Poland, Moravia, Hungary, and the coasts of the Adriatic, were ravaged by the conquerors; and, in effect, Eastern Europe was converted into a mere western segment of one prodigious Mogul empire, that extended through Asia to the Pacific, comprehending on the one side the Russians, and, on the other, the Chinese. Even after this unparalleled empire had been dissolved by the death, in 1294, of Kublai Khan, the grandson of Tchinghis, Russia continued to be but an appendage of one of its divisions, that of the so-called Kiptchak Tartars, or Tartars of the Golden Horde. For more than two centuries the Khans of this horde, whose favourite pastures were on the banks of the Volga, exacted tribute and homage from the Russian princes. When the representative of the Khan visited Moscow, the Russian *Veliki-Kniez*, or Grand-Prince, was obliged, it is said, to lead his horse by the bridle, and feed him with oats out of his royal cap. One grand-prince was even put to death by the Khan; and frequently the Russian lands were mercilessly plundered by their roving sovereigns. At length, however, the Grand-Prince, Ivan III., who reigned from 1462 to 1505, was able to throw off the yoke of the Kiptchak, and to reunite the various parts of Russia under one rule, incorporating in the general population such colonies of Mongols and Tartars as had, during the two preceding centuries, settled on this side of the Ural mountains, a measure of naturalization of so extensive a character as almost to convert into a literal fact the well known *mot* of Napoleon—"Scrape a Russian and you will find a Tatar." It was under Ivan III. that Russia first began to be regarded as one of the powers of Europe, and to enter on its career as a nation. His grandson, Ivan IV., surnamed the Terrible, added Siberia to his dominions, and exchanged the title of *Veliki-Kniez*, or Grand-Prince, which had hitherto been borne by the reigning sovereigns of Russia, for that of *Tsar*, or Emperor, now in use. Fedor, the son of Ivan, was an idiot; and by his death, in 1598, the male line of the descendants of Rurik became extinct. For fifteen years after this event Russia was but a theatre of confusion, a prey to intriguing

boyars and to invading Polish and Swedish armies; but, at length, in 1613, roused by a sense of danger, the Russians unanimously selected as their Tsar a nobleman, named Michael Romanof, a distant kinsman, by the female side, of the ancient Scandinavian house.

A third Asiatic invasion, different from either that of the Magyars or that of the Moguls, was that of the Turks proper, called also the Ottoman Turks, or the *Turks-Osmanlis*, the founders of the present Turkish rule. The Greek, or Byzantine empire, it is well known, had gradually dwindled from the time of its separation from the empire of the West, till, in the seventh and eighth centuries, it was all but swallowed up in the great Arabic or Saracen empire, extending from Spain to India, that was established by the Caliphs, the successors of Mohammed. The empire of the Caliphs itself, however, had been at length (1038-1200) superseded, so far at least as regarded Western Asia, by that of the Seljuk Sultans, a race of Turkish or Tatar chiefs, who, though professing the Mohammedan faith, to which they had been converted in their native steppes, had not scrupled to dethrone and reduce to vassalage the genuine successors of the Prophet. Their empire, in its turn, gave way to that of the Ottoman Turks; or *Turks-Osmanlis*, a branch of the general Seljuk race, which, originally established in Bithynia, spread thence, under the command of its first Emir, Ottoman or Osman, (1327,) over the whole of Asia Minor. Orchan, the son of Osman, assumed the title of Sultan; and his son Soliman crossed the Hellespont, and opening a passage through Thrace, (1358,) first brought the Turks into conflict with the nations of Eastern Europe, and commenced that long series of attacks upon the remaining fragment of the Greek empire, which terminated, in 1451, in the siege and capture of Constantinople. It was not with indifference that the Slavonian nations viewed the progress of this new and terrible enemy. The Servians, the Croats, the Bulgarians, &c., who had already, for a long time, been independent of the decrepit Byzantine Government, and under the rule of native Pans and Jupans, were all necessarily engaged in the struggle; and the Magyars of Hungary, then, as we have seen, at the height of their power, led their subject Tchekhes and the confederate forces of Eastern Europe, against the invaders. Still the Turks were victorious, Hungary was overrun by them; and for more than two centuries their name continued to be a terror to Europe. At length success declared itself on the side of the Christians; defeated before the walls of Vienna, (1683,) chiefly by the heroism of John Sobieski, king of Poland, the Turks were unable afterwards to make any decided impression, and, accordingly, on the 26th of January, 1699, they were

glad to conclude a treaty with the Germans, settling the boundary between the two empires. By this treaty, known as the peace of Carlowitz, Austria received back Hungary, with Croatia, Slavonia proper, and part of Dalmatia; while the Turks retained Servia, Bulgaria, and the part of the Dalmatian territory called Bosnia.

At the commencement of the eighteenth century, therefore, the Slavonians of Eastern Europe were still divided into four great bodies, not quite identical, however, with the four divisions of them that we found subsisting in the ninth century. The Muscovite, or Russian fragment of them, which was then but assuming shape under the sway of Scandinavian chiefs, had since been swelled by the annexation of the Cossack, Ruthenian, or Little Russian, and of other segments of the Lekkish population, into the Slavonian nucleus of an immense and complex empire, stretching from the Dnieper to the Icy Sea, and from the Baltic far into Asia, and governed in the most absolute manner by the will of the Tsar. Out of the principal mass of the Lekhs, or Central Slavonians, again, originally subdivided into the Poles and Lithuanians, there had been formed one united Polish nation, consisting of a caste of free nobles and a population of serfs, and occupying the lands to the south of Russia from the Oder to the Dnieper. Thirdly, out of the north-western fringe of the Lekhs, added to the whole body of the ancient Tchekhes, and to the northern portion of the Græco-Slavonians, there had been formed an immense Slavonic population attached to the confederate German empire—part adhering to Prussia, and governed by the Prussian kings, and the remainder (including the Bohemians, the Moravians, the Slovacks of Hungary, the Croats, the Slavonians proper, and the northern Dalmatians) adhering to Austria, and governed by the Austrian sovereigns, in professed accordance with special constitutions. Finally, the former Græco-Slavonian states of Servia, Bulgaria, and Bosnia, had, after many vicissitudes, been detached altogether from the Christian world, and annexed to the motley empire of the Turks, to be governed or misgoverned by Turkish pashas, dependent on the Sultan and the Ottoman Porte.

Though thus broken up, and, as it were, shared out among other races as an inheritance, the Slavonians had not altogether disappointed those expectations that a hopeful stranger—looking at them in their original condition, when they were but a vast aggregation of barbaric tribes, adoring Sviantovid, drinking mead, and dancing to the sound of the gusla—might have been led to form of them. It had been from no want of real *stamina* in themselves, but rather from an accumulation of irresistible circumstances from without, that, instead of founding a united

Slavonic empire in Eastern, and furnishing Slavonic dynasties to Western Europe, they had fallen asunder into fragments, some of which, like the German and Turkish Slavonians, were but appendages to foreign sovereignties, and others, like Russia and Poland, but the Slavonian patrimonies of foreign aristocratic houses. This singular tenor of their past history did not by any means demonstrate their incapacity to act a wholesale part in the general career of the human species, or the inferiority of the Slavonic to other races. On the contrary, as might more philosophically be argued, all this sifting and tearing apart of the Slavonian mass, and intermingling with it of foreign ingredients, German, Turkish, Mogul, and Magyar, had been but a necessary process of preparation, in order that, finally, the Slavonian genius might manifest itself with greater power and acceptance, just as some substances have their special and characteristic attributes not altered or extinguished by the limited interfusion of others, but only developed and made available. Various circumstances seem to indicate this, and to prove that, at the present moment, there lies underneath the uniform surface of Slavonian Europe a pent-up flood of future influences.

In the first place, the various Slavonic nations have all along taken a part in the general commerce and material ongoings of the world, such as only nations of good brain and faculty could have been equal to. They figure sufficiently well in M'Culloch's Commercial Dictionary, and in the lists and figure-tables of Manchester manufacturers. Russia, for example, with its marvellous capital, St. Petersburg, containing nearly 500,000 inhabitants, exports wheat, flour, cattle, furs, flax, oil, tallow, and hides, in large quantities; imports foreign commodities in return; and is altogether an important member of the European confederacy of nations. The Muscovite, or Great Russian part of its population, are the fondest of trading, and of industrial occupations generally; the Cossacks, or Little Russians, are bolder, less thrifty, and make better soldiers. Nor are the Slavonian populations under German rule inferior, after their respective fashions, to the Russians. The Slavonians of Prussia contribute their full share to the general prosperity of that remarkable country. The kingdom of Bohemia, with its capital, Prague, a town of about 110,000 inhabitants, is well known to be one of the most important of the manufacturing departments of the Austrian empire. Its glass has been celebrated since the thirteenth century; its northern districts are one continued manufactory of linens; and its calicoes, woollens, china-ware, cutlery, &c., employ thousands of hands. From the rich adjoining country of Moravia, the capital of which is Brünn, a town of about 35,000 inhabitants, there is a large export trade to various parts of Germany.

Hungary, whose commercial capital is Pesth, with upwards of 62,000, and its political capital, Presburg, with about 38,000 inhabitants, is said to excel almost any country in Europe in the abundance, variety, and value of its natural productions. It has coal-mines, and mines of all the metals except tin; it grows more wheat, maize, and oats, than it can use; it has whole forests of fruit-trees; tobacco is cultivated in nearly every part of it; it contains millions of sheep and cattle of good breeds; and its wines, the best of which is the sweet strong aromatic Tokay, yield to none in the world. So richly favoured by nature, the Hungarians do not practise many branches of manufacture, but import the manufactured goods they require in exchange for their superfluous home-produce. Nor is the prosperity of Hungary, such as it is, the sole work of its ruling inhabitants, the Magyars. The Slovaks of its northern districts, a branch of the Tchekhes of Moravia, are industrious cultivators of their Carpathian valleys; besides which, (whatever the fact may indicate,) a detachment of them, after the manner of the Italian organ-boys, are perpetually perambulating Germany, with countenances and eyes the most magnificent in the world, selling mouse-traps. The kingdoms of Croatia and Slavonia proper, too, politically incorporated with that of Hungary, and enjoying similar advantages of soil and climate, are by no means nests of savages. Agram, the capital of Croatia, a town of some 17,000 inhabitants, is a great market for the sale of Hungarian wheat, tobacco, and pigs; and the Croats, though rough fighting fellows, dwelling in barns without windows, make their own carts and ploughs, and drink their own wine and plum-juice. The Slavonians proper resemble the Croats; their chief town, Essek, is a handsome place, containing about 12,000 inhabitants, and, besides trading in grain, cattle, and hides, does a little silk-spinning. The capital of Illyria, which is the modern name of the patch of the Slavonian territory lying between the Venetians and the Croats, is the growing Austrian seaport of Trieste, the population of which is about 60,000; and even from the rude Dalmatians of the Adriatic, civilized Europe gets its favourite maraschino. Turning to the Slavonians that are under Turkish rule, we find among them the same evidences that industry and skill are not deficient in the Slavonic race. The Servians are a nation of traders. While they were under the absolute government of the Turks, their chief town, Belgrade, carried on extensive manufactures of woollens, carpets, and iron-ware; and though these manufactures were considerably injured by the brave war of independence which the Servians waged against their Ottoman masters in the present century, they are now reviving. The Bosniaks and the Bulgarians, the former consti-

tuting a distinct eyalet or province of the Turkish empire, and the latter included in the great eyalet of Rum-ili, are likewise nations of traders. The chief towns in Bosnia are Banyaluka, containing about 16,000, and Herzegovina, or Herzek, containing about 10,000 inhabitants.

If, again, we choose to regard as tests of the native faculty of a people the fact of their having or not having produced a literature, and the kind and quality of their literature, if they have produced one, neither, in these respects, will the Slavonian nations be found wanting. To the western world, indeed, Slavonian literature is as if it were not. A few eccentric scholars, it is true, have from time to time entered the jungle; and have brought back little translated specimens of what they have found there, chiefly in the form of songs and ballads; but the majority even of persons in quest of accomplishments are deterred by the mere look of Slavonian printed words casually seen, and are accustomed to declare that languages tolerating such words must consist of undisguised hiccoughs and sneezes. Nevertheless, it begins now to be known that, to the east of the great German literature, from which Western Europe has derived so much that is rich and ennobling, there lies another literature, as old, hardly less extensive, and quite as peculiar, the creation and property of eighty millions of Slaves. This literature divides itself into two great branches—the first comprehending the literature of the Slavonic nations attached to the Greek Church, and using the Cyrillic character, or modifications of it; the second comprehending the literature of the Slavonic nations now or originally attached to the Latin Church, and using the Latin character. The present is not the place to attempt any detailed sketch of the history of Slavonic literature in either of these branches. Of the first, suffice it to say that it includes a *Russian literature*, commencing from the eleventh century, and containing the works of a vast number of authors of all kinds; and a *Servian literature*, somewhat less extensive, but still considerable, and dating from the fourteenth century; besides special literary accumulations by the *Croats*, the *Slavonians proper*, and the *Dalmatians*, who, moreover, regard themselves as part-proprietors of the literature of the Servians. The second branch is even more important. It comprehends (1.) *Polish literature proper*, which dates from the twelfth century, and the golden age of which used to be placed in the interval between 1508 to 1632, prior to the new and splendid outburst which has taken place in our own times in such men as Niemcewicz, Lelewel, Mickiewicz, and Krasinski; (2.) *Lithuanian literature*, or the special literature of the Lithuanians as distinct from the Poles; and (3.) *Tchekk literature*, including the multitudinous literary productions of the Bohemi-

ans and Moravians, and of the Slovacks of Hungary, from the twelfth century downwards.

Regarding the worth of all this mass of literary matter, the deposit, during six centuries or more, of the mind of the Slavonian nations, it is of course impossible for any but a universal scholar to deliver a sound opinion. In Eichhoff, Wilkinson, and other writers, we see differences hinted at, that distinguish, it is said, the various dialects of the general Slavonic tongue from each other. The Russian literary language, it seems, is more harmonious and soft than most Slavonic dialects, a peculiarity ascribed to its richness in vowels; the Lithuanian is the harshest and least pure of all: and so on. In the spirit, too, of the different Slavonic literatures differences are discernible. In the literature of the modern Poles, the Servians, the Croats, and such other Slavonic peoples as have passed through periods of struggle and suffering, there is a fire, a verve, and a gloomy earnestness not found, it is said, in any other literature whatever: in light, mimetic writing, after the manner of many French and English authors, the Russians are believed to have succeeded best, though even among them a tendency to something higher is manifested in their admiration for Pushkin, the Russian Byron: and, lastly, for erudite reflectiveness, and a slow heavy adherence to the historic walk, not always pleasing to their more ardent brethren, the Tchekhes of Bohemia are among all Slavonians allowed the palm. Altogether, if we are to trust those who appear to speak from knowledge, the Slaves are proved both by their spoken language and by their written literature to be one of the superior races of our species. As regards the first, no more highly organized language, we are told, was ever spoken on earth than the Slavonic; vying in grammatical devices as it is said to do with the ancient Greek; possessing, for example, numerous declensions, an ablative case, a dual number, a patronymic termination, diminutive and augmentative nouns, frequentative and inceptive verbs, various preterite and future tenses, inflexions of verbs rendering pronouns unnecessary, unlimited powers of compounding words, and a host of serviceable particles; besides all which it includes every articulate human sound known, except the English *th*. Again, as regards Slavonic literature; here, it is said, with a due amount of all that varied intellectual vigour that is exhibited in the literature of the Indo-European races in general, there is discernible a certain important *difference* or originality, a certain peculiar something that is not Celtic, that is not Pelasgic, that is not Germanic, but solely and essentially Slavonic. This peculiarity of the Slavonic genius, this characteristic attitude, if we may so call it, of the Slavonian soul, naturally shows itself most clearly in the higher poetry

of the Slaves, and above all, in their popular songs and ballads. There, besides an intense nationality, and a burning hatred, in particular, to the Germanic races, partly produced, no doubt, by historical causes, but arising to some extent also from the consciousness of a difference of character, there prevails a certain large and melancholy wildness, as we occidentals would call it—a wildness as of a scared horseman in a great desert, urging his steed through the winds, with the far horizon in his eye. Nay, were we to allow the author of the *Revelations of Russia* to sum up for us in this place, we should have from him, in conclusion, a flat assertion of the general intellectual superiority of the Slavonic to the Teutonic races. Of this superiority, he says, the Slaves themselves are profoundly convinced. In the present state of our information, however, it will be wise to say as little as possible on that point.

There is still one other way in which the worth of a people may be estimated; by ascertaining, namely, whether they have, on any occasion, fought and resisted bravely, whether in their history there are any grand and heroic passages, whether they have ever stood forth before other men as the champions of a cause. Tried by this test, at least, the Slavonian peoples are safe. Of their primeval heroism, of their conflicts long and resolute with German, Turk, Mongol, and Magyar, we shall not speak; all that is but mist and song. Coming down, however, to a clearer day, what eye does not rest fondly on one hour at least in the European past, made memorable by Slavonian courage—the hour of Huss, of Jerome of Prague, and of Ziska, those three Bohemian patriots, who, seized at a distance by the spirit of the English Wycliffe, first spoke the bold truth in their native part of Europe, and scattered abroad, Slaves as they were, seeds that were but revived by the German Luther? Or, descending still later, to our own times, who has not heard of the brave struggle of the Servians against the Turks, a struggle continued during twenty-six years, (1804-30,) with a determination comparable to that of the Scotch under Wallace, and which resulted at last in a guarantee of virtual independence wrung by the subjects from their hard masters? Nay, and if farther proof should still be required, have we not one last argument at hand in the history of the Polish nation?

After remaining distinct for several centuries, the two nations that had formed themselves in the Tchekkish portion of the general Slavonian area, to wit, Poland and Lithuania, were united in 1385 by the marriage of Hedvige, the Queen of Poland, with Jagellon, the reigning prince of Lithuania. The throne of Poland being elective, however, while that of Lithuania was hereditary, the union was at first by no means complete; and it was

only in consequence of a tacit suppression on the part of the Polish nobles of their right to elect the sovereigns of their country, that the princes of the Jagellon line continued to rule in both nations. To put an end to this anomalous state of things, a formal arrangement was made in 1569, by which the Lithuanian sovereignty, becoming also elective, was merged in that of Poland, the Lithuanian nobles becoming entitled to all the privileges enjoyed by their Polish brethren, that of sitting and voting, for example, in the general Diet: but the laws, the armies, and the finances of the two countries to remain still distinct. By this arrangement, Poland attained the dimensions of a great European state, extending from the Oder to and beyond the Dnieper in one direction, and to and beyond the Dwina in another. Unfortunately, however, hardly had the union taken place, when Sigismund Augustus, the last of the Jagellon princes, died, (1572,) and the throne, till then elective but in theory, became elective in practice. From that day dates the decline of Poland. Internal Polish history became thenceforward but a continued series of election-struggles between different factions of the nobility, of intrigues on the part of foreign states interested in the success of different candidates, and of religious persecutions directed against the Protestant portion of the population. Occasionally, indeed, as for example, during the reign of the Hungarian Stephen Battori, (1575-1586,) or during that of John Sobieski, (1673-1690,) there was a flash of new splendour; but on the whole, the progress towards ruin was steady and uniform. The reconstruction and enlargement of the Muscovite kingdom under Ivan the Terrible, (1550,) and the subsequent accession to the Russian throne of the House of Romanof, (1613,) were disastrous events for Poland. Engaged in almost incessant wars with Russia, as well as with Sweden and Turkey, the Poles were reduced before the middle of the eighteenth century to a state of perfect helplessness. Even before the close of the seventeenth, they had lost part of their territories by ceding, on the west, the Lithuanian fief of Prussia to the Electorate of Brandenburg, to which it had till then belonged only dependently; and on the east, various Cossack districts on the Dnieper to Russia and Turkey. Their farther humiliation, however, if not their total annihilation as a nation, was the fixed scheme of the House of Romanof. Peter the Great, (1689-1725,) founding the Russian Empire by his genius, had chalked out for his successors a line of policy, leading, by implication, to the subjugation of Poland. It was reserved for Catherine the Great, (1762-1796,) to execute the project. The Polish throne becoming vacant in 1764, she sent a Russian army to compel the Diet to elect her former lover, Stanislaus Poniatowski. The Czartoryskis, then the heads of a

zealous Reform party in Poland, supported the nominee of the Empress, hoping the best results from her avowed liberalism. No sooner was Poniatowski elected, however, than Russian influence was employed to crush the reforms proposed by the Czartoryskis. A civil war followed; Russian armies occupied the country; and in 1772, took place, under Russian auspices, the first dismemberment of Poland. By this dismemberment, the Poles lost 3925 square German miles of their territories, or more than a fourth part of the whole. The confiscated lands were divided unequally between Prussia, Austria, and Russia; Prussia receiving the most valuable portions of Western Poland proper and Western Lithuania; Austria, the territories that now constitute the kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria; and Russia nearly the whole of her present provinces of Livonia, Witepsk, Mochilew, and Minsk. Thus diminished and degraded, Poland endeavoured to regenerate what was left of her. Again Russia, remorselessly interfered, and by a second dismemberment, (1792,) the Poles were deprived of 5614 square German miles of their territories, 1061 of which were appropriated by Prussia, and 4553 by Russia. Then ensued the last struggle under Kosciusko; on the suppression of which, (1795,) the third dismemberment took place; and Poland was effaced from the map of Europe.

"And rightly served!" cry our stern judges of the worth of nations. "A wrangling pack of some 200,000 nobles, with millions of serfs under them, uneducated and ill-fed: such was the Polish nation—a nation that deserved to die, if ever nation did!" Quick reasoning; very summary justice! Was Poland, under the Jagellons, in a worse condition than other countries in Europe? Even in her worst days, were her serfs more degraded beings than those of Russia now? Did not Poland, even in her later days, accomplish some things that were great—produce a Copernicus; give birth to a Sobieski? Was her crime of a bad constitution one unparalleled in the history of nations that have turned out well? Has the change been for the better? Have her spoilers, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, been more conscientious stewards of the interests of the Polish millions than those whom they superseded? Was there no evidence that a change was in progress in Poland herself at the very hour when her life was trampled out? A Poland organized by Kosciusko and Niemcewicz, what had it been in Europe now! Those struggles, too, of the Poles to regain themselves, those services under Napoleon, and insurrections under Nicholas that have scattered the Slavonic physiognomy over the earth, and filled our cities with men the types of energy—are they of no account? Above all, was the punishment a doom, or only a probation? Is there no pardon? has there been no repentance? Has not

Poland, territorially defunct, waxed morally stronger? Has not the sore trial of eighty years fulfilled its stated purpose; and if now, the chastened, united, Polish spirit were gathered as a thunderbolt, and let loose on Slavonic Europe, would it not split and nobly recreate it?

The following is a survey of the present arrangement of the Slavonic race, as quoted by Count Krasinski from the Slavonian Ethnography of Schaffarik:—

	Russia.	Austria.	Prussia.	Turkey.	Cracow.	Saxony.	TOTAL.
Muscovites or Great Russians,	35,314,600	35,314,600
Little Russians or Ruthenians,	10,370,000	2,774,000	13,144,000
White Russians,	2,725,000	2,725,000
Bulgarians,	80,000	7,000	3,500,000	3,587,000
Servians and Illyrians,	100,000	2,594,000	2,600,000	5,294,000
Croats,	11	101,000
Catholics,	1,151,000	1,151,000
Poles,	4,012,000	2,311,000	1,962,000	130,000	9,365,000
Bohemians and Moravians,	4,370,000	41,000	4,414,000
Slovaks in Hungary,	2,753,000	2,753,000
Lusatians or Wends,	82,000	60,000	142,000
Total,	53,502,000	16,791,000	2,108,000	6,100,000	130,000	60,000	78,691,000

Of these 78,691,000 Slavonians, (wholly distributed, it will be observed, with the exception of 190,000 Poles of Cracow and Wends of Saxony, among the four great powers of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Turkey,) 54,011,000 belong to the Greek Church: 19,359,000 are Roman Catholics: 2,990,000 (all of whom are Little Russians) are of the Greek Church united with Rome: 1,531,000 (chiefly in Austria and Prussia) are Protestants; and 800,000 (in Turkish Bulgaria and Servia) are Mohammedans.

Is this a state of things likely to continue? Is the Slavonic race, thus parcelled out among the four great powers of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Turkey, to advance into the future only as these powers conspire to draw it? No one can believe that this will be the case. Whatever may be thought of the Tsar Nicholas, whether he is to be accounted, as some think, an energetic and able man doing his best in a harsh way with a rude empire, or, as others think, a despot under whom even the material condition of the Russian people is unnecessarily wretched—it is as certain, at least, as that the concerns of sixty millions of men are more important than those of one man, that a day will come when Tsardom must be abolished.* Again, can an empire like that of Austria, in which, out of a population of thirty-four millions, only six millions are Germans, while at least sixteen mil-

* Worse than anything we have yet seen of the Emperor Nicholas is the fact, announced in the newspapers as we write, that he has issued a ukase, limiting the number of students in each of the Russian Universities to 300; and ordering, that in case the applicants shall exceed that number, the preference shall be given, first, to sons of nobles; and secondly, to youths intending to practise medicine. As

lions are Slavonians, continue to exist as it now is? Or finally, is it to be regarded as probable that six millions of Slavonians, almost all of whom are Christians, will remain long attached to an empire like that of Turkey—an empire already crumbling to pieces, and which every friend of the human race would desire to see at once dissolved, and for the sake of the twenty-three millions it misgoverns, undertaken by English or other competent hands? As confidently, then, as one may predict anything, one may predict a speedy change in the condition of Slavonian Europe.

For more than ten years the Slavonians themselves have been occupied with the thought of their coming regeneration, and with speculations as to the means and method of it. Two great theories on this subject have been given to the world—the one the so-called theory of Pan Slavism; the other, the theory of spontaneous separation into distinct nationalities.

The theory of Pan Slavism was, in its origin, purely literary. It was first promulgated by John Kollar, a Slovak or Tchekkh of Hungary, born in 1793, and who, since 1819, has officiated as the clergyman of a Protestant congregation in Pesth. In his youth, while still a theological student, Kollar had devoted himself to literature; and in 1824, or five years after his settlement at Pesth, he published a collection of sonnets, which at once gave him the first rank among living Bohemian poets. These sonnets, of which a new edition was published in 1832, consist of passionate representations of the condition of the Slavonian peoples, strung together by a story of ideal love. What woes the Slavonians have endured—what wrongs at the hands of Germans; how God will yet raise up prophets among them, and how there shall be a future Slavonian heaven for the heroes of the race, while its recreant sons shall dwell with Germans, Frenchmen, and Magyars in hell: such are the themes of the poet. Nor was the choice of such themes a mere literary whim. As a man, Kollar has no other thought than that of the regeneration of the Slavonic race. Slavonia is “his mistress, his religion, his muse;” he fasts, it is said, on the anniversaries of all days of Polish or Bohemian disaster; and the tears have been seen on his cheeks as he has told a story of the Slavonian past. This burning national feeling he has never ceased to express in every possible way. What he had treated emotionally in his sonnets he set himself to treat more intellectually and practically in various prose dissertations. Of these the most celebrated was a

there are six Universities in Russia, (at four of which, we believe, the average attendance exceeds 300, while at one it is 300 or 300,) this is equivalent to declaring that, out of a population of 60 millions only 1800 persons shall annually receive academic instruction. The action is monstrous; and the system of things with which it accords is an outrage on human intelligence.

treatise that appeared in 1828, entitled "*The Reciprocity of the Slavonians*." Here he demonstrated that, various as are the dialects spoken by the widely-spread Slavonic race, these dialects do not differ among themselves more than did the different dialects of the ancient Greek; and consequently, that as the ancient Greek nations had a common literary language and a common literature, the property of them all alike, so might the modern Slavonian nations, if they chose to decree it. To effect this end, he proposed that there should be established a literary reciprocity among all the Slavonian nations; that is, that all the Slavonian *literati*, Russian, Polish, Bohemian, or Servian, should make themselves acquainted with the different dialects and sub-dialects of their common language, so that the past as well as the future literary accumulations of each Slavonic people or tribe might be rendered accessible to all Slavonians, and a Panslavic literature thereby be instituted. This idea of Kollar almost immediately gained adherents in different parts of the Slavonic world. Among his own immediate countrymen, the erudite Tchekhs of Bohemia, Moravia, and Northern Hungary, its most illustrious proselytes were Jungman, Hanka, Schaffarik, and Palachy. Schaffarik, by birth a Slovack, and the most learned Slavonian alive, had published, almost contemporaneously with Kollar's Essay, a General History of the Slavonian Language and Literature; and, the coincidence of the views expounded in this work with those of Kollar leading to a closer association between the two men, Schaffarik has since rendered immense services to the Panslavic movement, by subsequent works on Slavonic Ethnography and Antiquities. Palachy, who is a Moravian by birth, and whose reputation as a historian is as great as that of Schaffarik as a scholar, has also lent his support, though in a less decided manner, to the same cause.

Neither Kollar nor his Bohemian adherents appear to have intended any immediate expansion of their theory beyond the field of literature. As originally conceived among the Tchekhs, indeed, the movement may be said to have borne the exact stamp of the Tchekhlsh character—it was reflective, scholarlike, prudent. Only perhaps in the breast of Kollar himself, who, among all the Tchekhs, has most of Polish fire and enthusiasm, was the notion of Panslavism connected with high revolutionary longings. Even from his pen, however, nothing of a political nature appeared, more specific than such passages as this:—"If of this metal (the Slavonic race) so multiform, I could cast one statue, I would make of Russia the head, Poland should occupy the heart, and Bohemia should perform the office of arms." It was probably, indeed, from the very trust reposed in this sluggish and merely reflective disposition of the Tchekhlsh-Slavonian mind, that the Austrian Government permitted the theory of Kol-

lar so freely to develop itself, and did not employ those means to suppress it, which, in the more alarming case of any Polish-Slavonian movement, would doubtless have been put in force. But if, as shaped and discussed among its authors, the Tchekhs of Bohemia and Northern Hungary, Panslavism was a mere dream of scholars, it received a wonderful expansion as soon as it had reached that peculiar spot of the Slavonic world, where, above all, it was welcome—the palace of the Emperor Nicholas. Thankfully accepting the intellectual conclusions of Kollar and Schaffarik, and delighted with the phrase in which they were symbolized and summed up, the Tsar and his minister Nesselrode converted the theory of literary Panslavism into that of a political Panslavism under Russia. That all the Slavonic nations should ultimately be gathered round Russia, so as, with her, to form one great Slavonic empire overspreading Eastern Europe, what finer scheme could a congress of Slavonic patriots devise than this? Forthwith all the organs of Russian opinion were employed in its behalf. At present Preus, Bodianski, and Srzevnesski, the professors of Slavonian literature respectively at the three Russian universities of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kharkow, are ardent Panslavists. Even among the Austrian Slavonians, not a few eminent and really worthy men, especially among those who had previously been literary Panslavists, have embraced the notion of a political Panslavism under Russia—a notion, it will be observed, that by no means pledges its holders to the system of despotism now existing in Russia, inasmuch as it is quite possible to conceive a great Panslavic empire administered constitutionally and federatively instead of by a Tsar.

As the theory of Panslavism originated, although not in its present political form, with the Slovakian Tchekh Kollar, so the other great theory, that of the spontaneous separation of the Slavonic mass into distinct nationalities, may be said to have originated in the labours of an Illyrian of plebeian birth, Dr. Ludowick Gaj or Gai. Previously well known as a literary man and a scholar, Gai commenced in the year 1835 a journal called the *Croatian Gazette*, published at Agram, the capital of Croatia. The leading idea of this journal was the consolidation of the several Slavonic nations of the extreme south, both Austrian and Turkish, viz., the Illyrians, the Croats, the Slavonians proper, the Servians, the Dalmatians, the Bosniaks, the Montenegrins, and the Bulgarians, into one body or state, to be called *Great Illyria*. These nations, Dr. Gai argued, properly constituted but one mass; they all belonged to what historians had called the Græco-Slavonic branch of the Slavonic stock; and though dissevered by circumstances, ought to be united. To facilitate this, however, various preliminary measures would be necessary, such as, the substitution of one common Illyrian lan-

guage for the different dialects, and of one common Illyrian alphabet for the two, (the Cyrillic of the Greek Church, and the Latin of the Roman Catholics,) then in use among the nations in question. With incredible industry Gai himself laboured to accomplish what was requisite. Abandoning his *Croatian Gazette*, he commenced two so-called *Illyrian Gazettes*, the one literary, the other political, but both included in the same subscription; he introduced what he considered a suitable and literary language, and devised a new Illyric alphabet; he organized an Illyrian scientific society, and a more extensive popular Illyrian club or publication society; he established at Agram a national Illyrian theatre; and finally, he undertook to write a national history of the Illyrian peoples. The movement soon extended from Croatia over all the nations that Gai desired to influence. The Carinthians, the Dalmatians, the Slavonians proper, the Servians, and finally, even the Bosniaks and the Bulgarians, felt the agitation: publications sprang up everywhere advocating Gai's opinions, and hundreds of young men began to talk enthusiastically of the future Great Illyria. At first Metternich did not find it necessary to offer any opposition to this movement; on the contrary, as it tended to assist the Austrian policy in Hungary by arraying the Croats and other Slavonians of Southern Hungary against the Magyars, he even encouraged it: ultimately, however, he deemed it proper to impose a slight check upon it, by forbidding the use of the word *Illyrian* in the new political acceptation that the patriots were giving to it.*

There is essentially, it will be observed, no contrariety, but rather an accordance, between the literary Panslavism of Kollar and the national Illyrian movement of Dr. Gai. The one is the broad ideal expression of Slavonic feeling, as developed among the erudite, reflective, and heavy Tchekhes: the other is a narrower, but far more intense and practical expression of the same feeling as developed among the keen, fierce Croats, and their neighbours, the Illyrians and Servians. On the one hand, Dr. Gai may accept, and doubtless does accept, the notion of a Panslavic literary association, extending from the Adriatic to the icy Sea; recently he has even constituted himself an agent of Russia, for his own purposes, among the Southern Slavonians: on the other hand, the more ardent of the Tchekhes, including Kollar himself, could hardly but approve of the idea of a provisional arrangement of the Slavonian nations for political purposes into several separate masses. At all events, not only did the views of Gai with reference to the construction of a single Illyrico-Slavonian state out of the Southern Slavonian peoples,

* For these facts regarding Dr. Gai, we are indebted to a paper on "The National Slavonian Movement," written by Mazzini in 1847. . . .

find acceptance among the Tchekhes, but a precisely similar movement arose among the Tchekhes themselves, having for its object the construction of a great Tchekkish-Slavonian state, to include the Western Slavonian peoples, namely, the Bohemians, the Moravians, the Slovacks of Hungary, and the Silesians of Prussia. The leading literary Panslavists of Bohemia, embracing this idea, founded an association like that of the Illyrians, for the purpose of expounding and advocating it; and hosts of publications charged with it, have of late years been distributed in Bohemia, and among the Slovacks.

Two great Slavonic nationalities having thus been imaginatively carved out of the general Slavonian mass of eighty millions, to wit, the *Illyrico-Slavonian* of the south, comprehending about eleven millions, and the *Tchekkish-Slavonian* of the west, comprehending about nine millions; the remainder naturally separated itself in the hands of the theorists into two nationalities more, to wit, the *Polish-Slavonian*, including the whole of Poland as it existed before the three partitions, and comprehending about eleven millions, and the *Russo-Slavonian* or *Russian*, comprehending the residuary forty-nine millions. The segregation of the great Slavonic family of nations into these four groups, it was agreed, was consistent no less with the traditions of the past and the feelings of the present, than with the interests of the future. Russian Slavonia, left still a large empire, would, it was believed, act as a civilizing power upon Northern Asia, and Illyrian Slavonia would co-operate with restored Greece against Turkey; while Tchekkish Slavonia and Poland would be added with the best effects to the confederacy of European states. The greatest difficulty in the way of the scheme as regarded the Tchekkish group, arose, it was acknowledged, from the Magyar question. Was Hungary to be associated, in its entire area, with the Tchekkish group, and a complicating Magyar element thus added to the otherwise purely Slavonian constituents of that group? or were the Slovacks alone of the inhabitants of Hungary, to be included in the group, and the Magyars left to shift for themselves? On the whole the leaning of the theorists was to the second of these alternatives.

Intermediate between the two schemes of a Panslavism under Russia, and a separation of the Slavonic family on Panslavistic principles, into four national masses, may be noted a third scheme that seems to have occurred to some isolated Slavonic thinkers, and, among them, to Count Krasinski. According to this scheme, the Slavonian peoples would most conveniently arrange themselves into two great empires of nearly equal dimensions—a reformed Russian empire, to include all the present possessions of Russia, except the Polish territories, in lieu of which, however, it might take the Slavonian countries now sub-

ject to Turkey; and a reformed Austrian empire, to include all the present Austrian populations, the Italians excepted, and to embrace also the whole mass of the Poles. Both these empires would be essentially Slavonic. In the former, for example, there would be about forty-nine millions of Slaves to eleven millions belonging to other races; in the latter, there would be twenty-four or twenty-five millions of Slaves to twelve or thirteen millions of other races, chiefly Germans and Magyars, who would, of course, be duly represented in the constitution. As regards Austria, its conversion from a Germanic empire, with vast Slavonic appendages, into a Slavonic empire, with Germanic members, would be but the execution of a project proposed by the Emperor Joseph towards the close of the last century.

Such were the different theories of political regeneration that were afloat in the Slavonic world, when that great series of events began by which Europe still continues to be agitated. The French revolution of February 1848, fell like a bomb amidst the states and kingdoms of Germany; and, like reluctant debtors threatened with legal terrors, the various German monarchs hastened to pay their subjects the constitutions that they owed them. On no part of the Germanic world was the effect more immediate than on Austria. Since the peace of Europe, in 1815, the policy of the Austrian Government, as administered by Metternich, had been systematically to repress all powerful intellectual or moral manifestation among the various populations subject to it, and to centralize all the activity of the empire in a strong irresponsible cabinet, or *camarilla*, at Vienna. With regard to most of the states (seventeen or eighteen in all) composing the empire, little difficulty had been felt in accomplishing the desired object—the imperial authority being in most all but supreme, both legislatively and executively, and the sole business of the diets or parliaments, in almost all such states as had them, being to forward representations to the imperial cabinet, and to oversee the collection of the taxes demanded by it.

In one state alone did there exist a constitution powerful enough to resist the attacks of the central authority, a nucleus of freedom so hard that Metternich could not melt it down. This state was Hungary, the land of the Magyars. At the time of her union with Austria, which was effected not by conquest, but by the marriage of Ferdinand I. of Austria with a Hungarian Princess, (1526,) Hungary, which then included Cróatia and Slavonia proper, was what is called a limited monarchy. The king had large prerogatives, but was held in check by a diet or parliament, consisting of the great Magyar nobles and the Catholic prelates, forming one table; and the representatives of the inferior nobles, and deputies from the towns, forming another. The population of the kingdom consisted almost entirely of two

races—the Magyars, the descendants of the Tatar conquerors of the ninth century, and the Slavonians, or conquered Aborigines, divided into Slovacks, Croats, and Slavonians proper. The former were the governing race; it was chiefly their interests that the Diet represented; and their higher class, or nobles, were exempt from all taxes, and enjoyed important feudal privileges. A Magyar-Slavonic kingdom, therefore, possessing an independent aristocratic constitution, and attached to the motley Austrian empire by the simple accident that the house of Hapsburg ruled over both—such was Hungary for more than three centuries. In the year 1842, according to Schaffarik, the population stood as follows:—Total population of the Hungarian kingdom, 11,662,000; Slavonians, (Slovacks, Croats, and Slavonians proper, together with Little Russians and Servian colonists,) 6,342,000; Magyars, or real Hungarians, 3,500,000; Germans and Wallachians, 1,820,000; Magyar nobles, exempt from taxes, about 350,000. The Magyar portion of the population (probably numerically underrated in the foregoing estimate) were an able, intelligent, and resolute race; the Magyar nobles and land-holders, in particular, were highly accomplished and educated men, speaking Latin with ease, conversant with German, and many of them also with French and English, and cultivating, besides, a native Magyar literature of no mean pretensions—very tenacious, however, of their feudal rights, and consequently regarded with extreme jealousy by their Slavonic subjects, as well as by those Hungarians of mixed descent, (included probably among the 6,342,000 Slavonians of Schaffarik,) in whom the pride of Magyar blood had been obliterated by the sense of present poverty and hardship.

In attempting to break up the exceptional Magyar constitution, so as ultimately to incorporate the independent kingdom of Hungary with the Empire, Metternich had made large use of the policy so familiar to Austrian rulers, *Divide ut imperes*. To rouse the national feeling of the Slavonic part of the population—to array the Slovacks of the north of Hungary, and the Croats, Servian colonists, and Slavonians proper of the south, against the Magyars, or proper Hungarians of the centre—had been his favourite method of attack. We have already seen how, for this end, he had tolerated and even fostered the Pan-slavic movement among the Tchekhes, and the national Illyrian movement among the Croats. These movements among the Slavonians of Hungary had naturally provoked a counter-movement among the Magyars. From time immemorial, all the business of the Hungarian Diet had been conducted in the Latin language—a device introduced probably to secure harmony among the different populations whose interests the Diet professed to represent, and which, though clumsy in other respects,

had tolerably well answered that purpose. In 1830, however, a movement had been begun, which had terminated, in 1844, in a decree of the Diet, ratified by the Emperor, abolishing the use of Latin in all the official transactions of Hungary, and substituting, with certain slight reservations in favour of Slavonian members of the Diet, the Magyar language. This decree had been wormwood to the Slavonian part of the population. The Croats and the Slavonians proper, having a provincial Diet of their own, subordinate to the general Hungarian Diet, had petitioned the Emperor for an entirely separate government, and had at length, in the true spirit of their leader, Dr. Gai, declared that they would give up Latin only for their native Croat or Illyrian. The Slovacks of northern Hungary, having no separate diet to complain through, had remonstrated in a more private manner. These dissensions, as well as other dissensions of a religious and social nature, had been sedulously encouraged by Metternich, who hoped, through them, to accomplish his long-meditated object, and finally get rid of that teasing anomaly in the Austrian empire, the free Hungarian constitution. Still, however, the Magyars, or at least the majority of them, stood firm: and, in 1847, their attitude towards the Austrian Government was bold and independent. Their ostensible leader, at this time, was Count Batthyányi; their greatest man was Louis Kossuth, a lawyer and journalist, forty-one years of age, with a body meagre and weighed down by sickness, and a deadly pale, melancholy face, that it was a pain to see. Already known over all Hungary for his sufferings in the national cause, gifted with a power of speech quite miraculous, and uniting a marvellous sagacity and genius for organization, with an oriental depth and fervour of soul, this noble man had been providentially returned to the Diet precisely at the time when his services were about to be required. A Magyar by birth, but with Slovak blood in his veins, his sympathies were with the oppressed, as well as with the governing race; and he was at the head of a party that had long been growing among the Magyars, and had at length attained the majority, whose aim it was to do away with feudal distinctions, raise the Slavonians to equality of rights with the Magyars, and form, of all the dwellers on the Hungarian soil, one great Hungarian nation.

The French Revolution of 1848, came opportunely for the Hungarian patriots. On the 4th of March, Kossuth made a motion in the Diet, to the effect that, "in order to secure the Magyar Constitution eternally threatened by the despotic system pursued in the other parts of the Emperor's dominions," measures should be taken to obtain for Hungary an independent executive, and otherwise to restore the kingdom to the exact status in which it had been at the time when, by the free vote of its Diet, it had

conferred the Crown on the House of Hapsburg. In the Lower House, the motion was carried unanimously; and was followed almost immediately by a resolution in favour of the abolition of all feudal burthens throughout Hungary. The Upper House, containing an Austrian party, suspended its sittings. Metternich and the Austrian camarilla prepared to dissolve the Diet, and to place Hungary under military rule. But Vienna itself rising in revolution, (13th March,) the camarilla was broken up, and Metternich driven into exile. Those in whose hands he left the government—men of his own stamp, overawed by the circumstances of the hour—yielded everything; to the Hungarians the independent ministry they desired, and the imperial assent to the proposed abolition of feudal rights and civil reconstitution of the country; to the Viennese, a constitution for Austria, with freedom of the press, a national guard, and all the established accompaniments.

Under the Archduke Palatine Stephen, as Viceroy of the kingdom, the new Hungarian ministry assumed office on the 11th of April. Count Batthyanyi was President, and Kossuth Minister of Finance. The proposed reforms in the internal condition of Hungary had, in the mean time, been matured in the Diet, and were now carried into effect; feudal burthens were declared obsolete; the Slavonians were invited to exercise the full rights of citizenship; the Magyar proprietors yielded a large portion of their lands to the occupant peasantry; preparations were made for the return, by an extensive and searching suffrage, of a new and fair representation of the whole Hungarian people, to assemble at Pesth on the 2d of July; and altogether, Hungary seemed to be entering on the brightest period of her history. The Slovacks, the naturalized Servians, the Germans, and the Wallachians, appeared all to appreciate the admirable conduct of the Magyars, and to be willing to act in the same spirit of union and self-denial. Even the Croats had not been forgotten. The number of federal representatives to be sent from Croatia and Slavonia to the Hungarian Diet had been raised from three to eighteen; the use of the Slavonian language in the provincial Diet of Croatia, and the provincial independence of that Diet, had been guaranteed; and the Croats had been invited to point out any specific measures that they might wish adopted for the promotion of a better understanding between the two countries. Treated thus considerately, the Croats and Slavonians could not but acquiesce; and the dream of an Illyrian Empire was for the moment laid aside.

A month or two, however, sufficed to change all this. The Austrian Court, tired of the farce of liberalism, and rendered desperate by the conduct of the Viennese, who were evidently bent on a real Revolution, had removed to Innsprück, and was

there beginning to lay deep schemes for the restoration of absolutism. To throw themselves into the hands of the army; to incite the army to act the part of prætorian guards and re-establish the Imperial system as if by main force, was the scheme of the courtiers. The veteran Latour, who was appointed Minister of War, was the very man to carry out such a scheme. From Innsprück, secret communications were sent to the various divisions of the army; and the soldiers and officers were universally taught to regard Prince Field-Marshal Windischgrätz, then governor of Prague, and the most aristocratic and gentlemanlike of Austrian commanders, as the man destined by Providence to take matters into his own hands, rescue the poor Emperor from the meshes of the Revolutionists of Vienna, and restore the integrity of the Empire. For many reasons, however, it was deemed advisable to begin with Hungary. The Hungarians once crushed, it would be easy to deal with the Viennese and the Austrians. But evidently the most efficient way of bringing to wreck the Hungarian movement, and the way, at the same time, that would least compromise the Court, was to resuscitate the national feeling of the Croats and Slavonians of Hungary, and play it off against the Magyars. This was accordingly done. Dr. Gai, whose fixed idea of a future Illyrian Empire, with Croatia included in it, was obviously imperilled by the course that Hungarian affairs were taking, lent himself as a willing instrument to the Austrian camarilla. The Croats and Slavonians, or at least all of them that had been previously smitten with the Illyrian fever, were easily roused. In order that they might have a competent chief, the office of Ban or Lord of Croatia, Slavonia proper, and Dalmatia, was conferred by the Emperor on the Baron Joseph Jellachich, a Slavonian of Bosniak descent, who had served all his life in the Austrian army, had written songs for the German soldiers, and had held a command in that peculiarly constituted part of the Austro-Hungarian territories known as the "Military Frontier," and whose conduct hitherto, while it had by no means uniformly pleased the Court, had earned him an immense influence over his countrymen, the Croats and southern Slavonians. A political disciple of Dr. Gai, Jellachich was but too ready to forward the darling Illyrian project by doing the bidding of the Court, and leading the Croats against Hungary. Successful in such an enterprise, and the acknowledged saviours of the Austrian Empire, would not the Croats then be in a position of importance that would enable them to demand their own price? In this natural but somewhat ungenerous expectation—an expectation which, as is usual when a scheme is more cunning than chivalrous or truthful, the event has woefully disappointed—the Croats did not stand alone. The Servians of southern Hungary, the descendants of Servian refugees that had settled there at various

times, were roused in a similar manner, by the joint influence of Raiachich, the subtle Archbishop of the Greek Church in Servia, and George Stratomirovich, a fierce Servian officer in the Austrian army, both of whom were also disciples of Dr. Gai. In all these transactions, too, Russian influence was discernible. The Russian consul at Belgrade was seen to be at work; and Russian Pan Slavism and Illyrian nationalism, like the man and the horse in the fable, had evidently struck a league.

The Hungarians (with whom, on this occasion, the Slovacks and Ruthenians of northern Hungary, the Germans, and the Wallachians, as well as not a few even of the Servians, most honourably coalesced) remonstrated against the hostile preparations of the southern Slavonians. They called on the Emperor to repudiate and forbid them. The Emperor seemed to agree. Jellachich, who had of his own authority summoned for his purpose a Croat-Slavonian-Dalmatian Diet, received (29th May) a formal imperial order not to hold it, and to repair at once to Innsprück. Perfectly understanding the meaning of this order, he disobeyed it, and the Diet met. Again the Hungarians remonstrated; and again the Emperor disclaimed his agent. On the 10th of June, an order was even issued suspending the Ban from all his functions, military and civil, and declaring him guilty of high treason. This order too, Jellachich treated as null; and on the 14th of June, appearing at Innsprück, he was received, not as a traitor, but as a faithful and loyal servant of the Emperor.

Meanwhile the absolutists were gathering strength for the contest. The Italian victories of Radetsky adding boldness to their counsels, they brought back the Court to Vienna, where already the Austrian Diet, that most incompetent of Parliaments, was sitting and debating. The military scheme of Latour now began more openly to develop itself; and for the first time, Windischgrätz was called upon to employ his cannon. Imitating the conduct of the rest of the world, and jealous in particular of the Frankfort Assembly, in whose schemes for the Germanization of Eastern Europe, it was to be feared the interests of the Slavonians would be too much overlooked, the Tchekhes of Bohemia had demanded a national existence, equivalent to that of the Hungarians, separate from Austria. Was not this the time, the poor Bohemians thought, for making a demonstration in favour of their long cherished Pan Slavism, or at all events for doing something towards the formation of the great Western Slavonic state, that had been so long talked about! If Dr. Gai was on a fair way to succeed with *his* Great Illyria in the south, why should they not have a prospect of *their* Tchekkish Slavonia too; nay, why should not the fine proposition of the four Slavonic groups or nationalities be at once initiated, and the new Poland also

called into existence? Full of these sanguine hopes, the Bohemians, though refused their demands by the Emperor, had summoned a Slavonic Congress to meet at Prague, and to consist of sixteen deputies, sent respectively from each of the three Southern Slavonic groups of nations, Russia, for obvious reasons, not being included. This congress had actually met, (May,) and was discussing the various theories of Slavonic regeneration, when the inhabitants of Prague, tired of inaction, rose (11th June) in open revolt. Windischgrütz, whose wife was killed at a window by a bullet during the insurrection, stormed the town and placed it under martial law. This effected, he was the better prepared, both morally and intellectually, to do what was required of him, and crush insurrections elsewhere.

Nor was it long before his stern services were again in demand. On the 2d of July, the new Hungarian Diet, returned according to the extended suffrage, assembled at Pesth. In order to show decisively that the Emperor and the Hungarians were on good terms, and that the rumour was false that Jellachich had secret instructions from the Court, the Hungarian ministry were anxious that the Emperor should come to Pesth, and open the Diet in person. Their request to that effect, however, was not granted: and the Diet was opened by the Archduke Palatine. The first business of the Assembly was to open negotiations with Jellachich, with a view to a satisfactory settlement of the whole question between Croatia and Hungary. Jellachich was stubborn; and at once waiving all merely Croatian considerations, plainly intimated that he would treat on no other basis than the submission of the Hungarians to the Austrian Government—a submission to be signified by the immediate abolition of the separate Hungarian ministries of War and Finance, so that the army and revenues of Hungary might be under Austrian control. Thus was the secret, at last, divulged; Jellachich was but the agent of the Austrian absolutists; and the national Croatian movement was but a pretext and a lie. Had any farther proof of this been necessary, it was furnished on the 4th of September, when the decree suspending Jellachich from his functions as Ban, was withdrawn by the Emperor.

The die was cast. On the 9th of September, Jellachich at the head of 65,000 Croats invaded Hungary, and advanced in a bloody track towards Pesth. The Hungarian ministry, with Count Batthyanyi at its head, resigned. The Court, its object being to gain time, prevented the formation of a new ministry. The whole business of the hour devolved on Kossuth and his able associates. As early as the 11th of July, Kossuth as Finance-Minister had demanded from the Diet a levy of 200,000 men. It had been granted with acclamation; but as yet the Hungarian forces in the field numbered but a few thousands.

With unparalleled energy Kossuth hastened the levy ; Hungary from end to end was roused by the thunder of his proclamations ; and on the 29th of September, Jellachich, beaten in his first great battle with the Hungarians, was a fugitive towards the Austrian frontier. The Austrians, who had expected to hear that the Ban had taken Pesth and conquered Hungary, were thunderstruck when he and his Croats were known to be marching upon Vienna. As his defeat, however, had been concealed, the meaning of the movement was not understood, and the perplexity was increased when on the 4th of October there appeared in the *Vienna Gazette* an imperial manifesto, dissolving the Hungarian Diet, placing Hungary under martial law, and appointing the Ban governor of the country. The Viennese, sympathizing with the Hungarians, were in a state of phrenzy ; and, on the 6th, availing themselves of the dissatisfaction of a German grenadier battalion that had been ordered to the scene of the war, they rose in insurrection. The streets were barricaded, the war-office was taken, and the minister Latour hanged from a lamp-post ; and the Court having, at length, fled, the city remained in the hands of the triumphant revolutionists. The democratic members of the Diet, aided by the students, assumed the government. Soon, however, attracted to the scene of tumult, came four very important personages, democratic members of the Frankfort Diet ; Fröbel, Hartmann, Trampusch, and Blum. Nor was a soldier wanting to take the military command. Bem, a Galician Pole, who had served in his youth with the French in Russia, and had afterwards shared the misfortunes of his nation, and led a life of exile and adventure in England, France, and other countries, had been enabled by the events of 1848 to return to Galicia ; and accident having led him to Vienna only a day or two before the Revolution, the Viennese were glad to entrust to such a man the command of their National Guard.

The Revolution in Vienna was an interval of grace for Hungary. The whole force and strategy of the Court party had for the time to be concentrated upon the single object of reducing the Viennese. Windischgrätz, hastening to unite his troops with those of Jellachich, declared (20th October) the city in a state of siege. For ten days the defence was continued, the sole hope of the Viennese being that the Hungarians would, in the mean time, advance to their relief. Unfortunately, however, reasons of ceremony interfered to prevent this. The Hungarian general Moga and his officers, many of whom held commissions in the Austrian service, hesitated to invade the Austrian territory, and demanded, in their justification, an order from the Viennese Diet ; the Viennese Diet hesitated to give such an order ; the Diet at Pesth, too, wavered at the critical moment, and after

sending to their General a peremptory injunction to attack the besiegers, countermanded it. At length Kossuth, who had in the mean time been appointed President of a Committee of Defence, entrusted, in the absence of a regular ministry, with full ministerial functions, came in person to the Hungarian headquarters, bringing 10,000 men, thirty pieces of artillery, and his own courage with him. In a council of war held on the 27th, and in which only two officers, Colonel Görgey and Major Pastelnik, stood by Kossuth, his authority was definitively exerted, and the order to march was given. But it was too late. The Viennese were wearied out; and when on the 30th, the Hungarians appeared before the city, and engaged the forces of Windischgrätz, the bombardment was already at an end. The Imperialists entered Vienna to hang and to shoot; and the Hungarians retreated into their own country to prepare for a long winter.

Now was the hour of Kossuth. Although not a soldier himself, he could organize armies, choose generals, and make a nation fight. Money and stores were collected; men levied and drilled; powder mills set at work; and all Hungary was filled with the clang and confusion of arms. The places of Moga and other irresolute officers, were supplied by new men, sought out and promoted on the instant—Görgey, Dembinski, Klapka, Perczel, Damianich, Guyon, men of all nations, Magyars, Slavonians, Englishmen. On Bem, the brave Pole, saved from the fate of Blum by a difficult escape from Vienna, was immediately conferred a high command. Such were the visible signs of preparation; of the invisible and unknown reality who shall speak—of the thoughts, prayers, and fears of ten millions of human beings, as fit for liberty as the people of England, and spread over a country twice as large? Worthless, indeed, the heart that, beating freely in this land of ours, franchised for us by the blood of our fathers, can think unmoved of those millions of our contemporaries striving to do the like for their children, albeit they do live in Eastern Europe, and call themselves Magyars!

In December 1848 the war was begun. An Imperial army of 130,000 men under Windischgrätz as commander-in-chief, and Jellachich and other generals of note as his subordinates, entered Hungary. The movements of the various divisions of this army, and the countermovements of the Hungarians, during the four months that followed, will some day form a subject of study for such as shall be interested in military science. At present the details are hardly known. Suffice it to say that, during these four months, the Hungarians beat their enemies again and again; beat them in slight engagements, and in pitched battles; beat them in bravery and in strategy; beat them at the very time when the Austrian journals were publishing lying reports of vic-

torics gained by the Imperialists, and when hardly a true account from beleaguered Hungary could reach the rest of Europe. All that title to freedom, therefore, that arises from lion-like courage, from fierce hard obstinacy, from perfect soundness of head joined to strength of heart, from unwearied and successful perseverance in a course once begun—a title more respected by the world in general, and by Englishmen in particular, than any arising from mere historic or metaphysic right—this the Hungarians showed themselves most unmistakably to possess. In one other respect, too, they proved the superior temper of their race. Fighting against generals the most pitiless and barbaric that ever took the field, men that, defeated in battle, would hang, shoot, burn, flog, and call it military firmness, the Hungarians carried all gently, heroically, like a people noble in misfortune. That such a people should win would be a boon to the world. Nor, had they been left, they and their natural enemies, to fight it out equally between them, could the result have been doubtful. One more trial, however, was to be heaped upon them. Already, in April 1849, had the Austrians been driven from Hungary: already in the same month had the emancipated Hungarians proclaimed their freedom, and chosen Kossuth their first chief and President, with other ministers, both Magyar and Slavonian, to assist him, when the flood-gates of northern despotism were opened on Austrian solicitation, and the expected tide rushed in. In the end of April 50,000 Russians crossed the Hungarian frontier. Other armies have followed in their track. And now for three months has the war been waging between the Hungarians and the united Russian and Austrian armies. The efforts of the Hungarians have been unprecedented; like brave men, they have staked all on their last struggle. In their first battles they beat the Russians, as they had already beaten the Austrians; at the moment that we write, however, matters wear a more perplexed aspect, and all Europe waits with anxiety to know the issue. Should the Hungarians finally be victorious, the results will be most beneficial; in Eastern Europe there will be founded a free Magyar-Slavonic State, stronger and greater than Austria, a splendid commercial member of the European commonwealth, and a nucleus round which the Slavonic races may gradually and conveniently form themselves according to their common Panslavic or their separate national tendencies: should the Russians, on the other hand, win the day, then there will be Panslavic Empire in right earnest; the Tsar, overruling decrepit Austria like a master, will place his foot upon Constantinople, and look scowlingly towards the European West, and this state of things will continue till the coming blow shall be struck that shall shiver Russia itself in pieces, and proclaim a new era for the enfranchised world.

- ART. X.—1. *The Railways of the United Kingdom Statistically considered, in relation to their Extent, Capital, Amalgamation, Debentures, Financial Position, Acts of Parliament by which Regulated, Creation and Appropriation of Shares, Calls, Dividends, &c., concisely arranged, from Authentic Documents.* By HARRY SCRIVENOR, Secretary to the Liverpool Stock Exchange. London, 1849. 8vo. Pp. 840.
2. *The Railways of Great Britain and Ireland Practically Described and Illustrated.* By FRANCIS WHISHAW, Civil Engineer, Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. London, 1840. 4to. Pp. 574. With Seventeen Plates.
3. *An Historical and Practical Treatise upon Elemental Locomotion by means of Steam Carriages on Common Roads.* By ALEXANDER GORDON, Civil Engineer. London, 1833. 8vo. Pp. 192.
4. *Past and Present Views of Railways.* By ALEXANDER GORDON, Esq., Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. London, 1849. Pp. 20.
5. *Stokers and Pokers, or the London and North-Western Railway, the Electric Telegraph, and the Railway Clearing House.* By the Author of Bubbles from the Brunnens of Nassau. Published in Murray's Colonial Library, No. 66. Pp. 208.
6. *Report of the Commissioners of Railways, 1848.* Part I. London, 1848. Pp. 224.
7. *Report of the Commissioners of Railways, 1848.* Part II. London, 1849. Pp. 220.

It has been lately shown that there is poetry in science, and more recently it has been asserted that there is poetry even in railways. We cheerfully adopt both these propositions in all their truth and beauty, and are surprised only at the limitation with which the sentiment has been surrounded. Poetry acknowledges no boundary to its domains. Its strains are breathed throughout the physical as well as the moral world—its music is heard among the spheres—it chaunts its lays over the loves of the plants, and its sympathies are entwined even round the sufferings and enjoyments of irrational existence. What a noble epic is the universe itself! delineated in radiant hieroglyphics on the azure canvass of the firmament, as explored by the space-penetrating tube of the astronomer, and deciphered by the analysis of the mathematical sage. What a melodrame is exhibited on our own globe, while it speeds in ether its annual and its daily round;—on our earth-home—the stage upon which man has so long strutted his brief hour, emblazoning his vices and his crimes,

and rioting in giddy frivolity above burning caverns and primeval tombs, and among the contemporary dead, over whom he has himself sighed and wept.

Beneath the lava crust on which he daily treads and slumbers, he witnesses the tragedy of the pre-Adamite age, in which all the characters have perished, without leaving a seed behind;—while on its surface is played the comedy of inodern life, in which intellectual and immortal man eats, and drinks, and dies; and exhibited the farce, in which kings and conquerors are reproduced in clay, or embalmed by the apothecary, or thrust under ground by the sexton. Nor is the poetry of life thus limited to humanity with its conflicting interests and passions. It claims a right of song over the speechless denizens of the forest and the heath, of the ocean and the air. The Pierian spring has tributaries even in the haunts of ferocious natures; and with the blood-stained hearth of the tiger, and the roofless home which the jungle or the rock affords to the carnivorous pilgrim, there are associations of tenderness and love, of suffering and enjoyment, more noble and affecting than those which are linked with the lower and more savage grades of humanity. When animal and intellectual life are sheltered under the same roof, and when instinct and reason are auxiliaries in the house or on the heath, we learn to appreciate the virtues and the affections, if not the knowledge and the wisdom, of the brutes that perish.

The poetry of mechanism is one of the most interesting departments of the poetry of science, and that of railways cannot fail to be regarded as the Iliad of its productions—embracing the account of works the most expensive and gigantic—the description of engines the most ingenious and complex, and the history of social ameliorations which are now altering the very condition of man—virtually extending the very term of his existence, and opening new and extensive fields for the exercise of his holiest and noblest affections.

It is not our design in the following Article to amuse the reader with any account of those singularly curious and interesting arrangements* which have been rendered necessary by the great and rapid extension of the railway system, for the comfort and security of the millions whom it accommodates. Our object is to give the general reader some idea of the origin, progress, and extent of the railway system—of the ingenious inventions and stupendous works which it has called into existence—of the social triumphs which it has achieved—of the improvements of which it is susceptible, and which are necessary

* This has been already beautifully done by the distinguished author of "*Stokers and Fokers*," a work well worthy of the reader's perusal and study.

for the security of life and property—of its present state and prospects as a commercial speculation, and of the necessity of protecting it as a great national institution,—by the development of the whole traffic of the empire—by the grant of public aid—by placing all the railways in the kingdom under the management of Government, and by preventing in future that enormous expenditure of railway capital which has been so unnecessarily sunk in the preliminary stages of their existence, and which has led to the ruin of many of those enterprising capitalists to whom the public are indebted for the commencement and completion of these great undertakings.

Great Britain has long been distinguished among civilized nations by the magnitude and splendour of her public works. Her harbours, docks, and breakwaters, her canals, bridges, aqueducts, and lighthouses, have ever been the boast of our country, and the admiration of foreign lands. The Docks of Liverpool, the Breakwater at Plymouth, the Caledonian Canal, the Pontcysylte Aqueduct, the Menai Bridge, and the Eddystone and Bell-Rock Lighthouses, should be familiar to every Englishman, and should be described in the humblest of our schools. But noble and magnificent as these public works are, they almost sink into insignificance when placed beside the gigantic undertakings which form a part of the Railway system of England. Science demanded from matter powers and functions which fancies the most sanguine never deemed it to possess. Reason broke down the barrier of physical impossibilities, and advanced to the breach where Imagination did not dare to follow it. The strongholds of time and space were stormed and captured; and the possessors of wealth, placing a generous confidence in human genius, offered their homage to the iron crown for which a bloodless victory had achieved the empire of space.

Like all great inventions, that of Railways was of slow growth; and so divided has been the merit of the various engineers to whom we owe it, that no individual has been bold enough to claim it for himself. The ancients had formed no conception of its nature. Poets and philosophers had not descried it, even in the far distance; and if it was anticipated at all, it was by the far-seeing eye of prophetic inspiration. "Make straight in the desert," says Isaiah, "a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed;"*—and Daniel

* This passage is supposed by some commentators to refer to the great highway which Semiramis formed by cutting and filling up hollows on her march to Ecbatana.

looks forward to the “time of the end, *when many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.*”

But whatever may have been the anticipations of science and prophecy, the true railway may be regarded as the invention of the present century. Railways were indeed constructed and used at some of the Newcastle collieries about the beginning of the seventeenth century. These early lines were constructed wholly of timber; and it was not till 1767 that an experiment was first made, the object of which was to substitute iron for wood. This experiment either seems to have failed, or to have excited no notice, for so late as 1797, Mr. Carr put forward a claim to the invention of cast-iron rails. The lines which were constructed in the last century were merely tracks of wood, stone, or iron, along which waggons were dragged by horses, and they were confined to local establishments, but principally to collieries. The diminution of the number of horses required to perform a given portion of labour upon an iron path amply repaid the interest of capital and the expense of maintenance, and men soon saw that such lines might be advantageously constructed on a larger and more comprehensive scale. An act for the first public railway in England was obtained in 1801, and from that time to 1837 no fewer than 178 of these acts were obtained. From one or two annually they began to increase in 1825, when their number rapidly augmented, as shown in the following table:—

Acts.		Acts.		Acts.	
1824,	. . 2	1829,	. . 9	1834,	. . 14
1825,	. . 5	1830,	. . 9	1835,	. . 18
1826,	. . 6	1831,	. . 9	1836,	. . 35
1827,	. . 6	1832,	. . 8	1837,	. . 14
1828,	. . 11	1833,	. . 11		

The most important of these railways were those in the neighbourhood of Newcastle, which were used for the conveyance of coals to the shipping wharfs on the Tyne and the Wear; and of these the Stockton and Darlington was the most perfect. An act was obtained for it in 1823, and it was opened on the 27th September 1825. All kinds of locomotive power were employed upon this line—locomotive engines, horses, and fixed engines; but as it consisted only of a single line of rails, with passing places, the engineer experienced serious interruption arising from the horses or other trains of carriages travelling in opposite directions. The ascents and descents on this line were numerous, and it was impossible for any locomotive, and still less for the imperfect engines of that day, to work with any advantage on such an uneven line. These defects consequently became more apparent; and as horses were out of the question, it was on this

line that the advantages and disadvantages of the two species of mechanical power—the fixed and locomotive engine—were first studied, and the problem finally solved. This was effected by the labours of the Directors and the Engineer of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, who sent a deputation of two professional engineers to inspect the working of the Stockton and Darlington line. These engineers gave in their reports on the 9th March 1829. They reported that the advantages and disadvantages of the two systems were pretty equally balanced, but that, upon the whole, looking especially at the expense of each, *the fixed engines were preferable*. Mr. Stephenson, the Company's engineer, was, however, of a different opinion. He considered the locomotive as the most economical, and by far the most convenient moving power. The Directors were therefore induced, and with some difficulty, to look favourably on this engine; and they wisely offered a premium of £500 for the most approved locomotive engine, to be submitted to public trial on the 6th October 1829. Four beautiful engines accordingly appeared at Rainhill, on the Liverpool and Manchester line; the *Novelty*, by Messrs. Braithwaite and Ericsson of London; the *Rocket*, by Messrs. Robert Stephenson & Co., Newcastle, with a new boiler, the invention of Mr. H. Booth; the *Sans Pareil*, by Mr. T. Hackworth of Darlington; and the *Perseverance*, by Mr. Burstall of Leith. The extraordinary speed of the engines excited among the spectators universal surprise: but in the opinion of the distinguished engineers who were appointed judges, the *Rocket* was found entitled to the premium.

The superiority of the locomotive being thus determined, a new problem of equal importance required to be solved. During the comparative trial of the engines at Rainhill, the *Rocket* frequently ascended the Whiston inclined plane, the inclination being 1 in 96, with a carriage containing twenty or thirty passengers, at the rate of from 15 to 18 miles an hour. The ease and regularity with which the work was performed led the ignorant to believe that it was as easy to travel up an inclined plane as upon a level; and engineers of talent and experience were thus induced to countenance schemes by which steam-carriages should be employed on roads with long and steep hills. In 1825, Mr. Gurney constructed a steam-carriage, which made experimental trips in the neighbourhood of London, and in 1829 he constructed another, in which he travelled from London to Bath and back again. A part of the machinery was broken at the outset; but on his return he performed the last 84 miles, from Melksham to Cranford Bridge, in ten hours, including stoppages. Other steam-carriages, constructed by Messrs. Sum-

mers and Ogle, Mr. Hancock, and Mr. Stone,* were in daily use for several months on common roads; and so prevalent had the idea become, that "the perfecting of the means of interior communication would be effected by steam-carriages to the exclusion of railways, that in the year 1831 a Committee of the House of Commons presented to Parliament a very favourable Report on the subject." The attempts which were made, in consequence of this report, to substitute steam-carriages on common roads in place of railways, completely failed; and experience soon established the important truth, that steam travelling could only be advantageously performed on planes nearly level, and on lines nearly straight.

The first of the great lines with which England is now covered was the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, which has been justly called *The Grand British Experimental Railway*. The scheme originated in 1824, but the Company was not incorporated till 5th May 1826, when the Act received the Royal assent. It carries on its operations under nine Acts of Parliament, and now belongs to the London and North-Western Company. It was perhaps unfortunate for railway speculation that this Railway should have been, as Mr. Scrivenor calls it, "the first-born of the great family of railways—the pilot—the pioneer—the model, after which all others were to shape their course and fashion their appearance." No works of extreme magnitude were required in its construction. The line of its course was comparatively level, and, uniting the manufacturing metropolis of England with Liverpool—the greatest thoroughfare in the world—its success as a commercial speculation was certain, and hence it gave encouragement to other undertakings, where equal success could scarcely be anticipated, and to some where ultimate loss was unavoidable. It was, on the other hand, fortunate for the Railway system, that its first effort united two such opulent cities. The wealth and public spirit of its directors, and the great objects which they contemplated, enabled them to put down the powerful combinations of interested parties which were marshalled in order to crush the railway system in its infancy, and to solve all those problems, and overcome all those difficulties, which would have perplexed a less powerful proprietary.

In 1833, Acts were obtained for the Grand Junction Railway

* Messrs. Summers and Ogle's steam-carriages ran on the Southampton road, often fifteen and sometimes thirty miles an hour. In 1831, Mr. Hancock's steam-carriage carried passengers from Bow and Stratford to and from Mile-end Road. The carriages of Sir W. Dance, superintended by Mr. Stone, and made by Mr. Gurney, ran between Gloucester and Cheltenham four times a day for four months, from the 21st of February to the 22d of June 1831, having carried nearly 8000 persons, and travelled nearly 4000 miles. The distance, which was nine miles, was travelled on an average in fifty-five minutes, but frequently in forty-five!

from Warrington to Birmingham, and for the London and Birmingham Railway, so as to unite with the Metropolis the three great cities of Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham. Although these new lines presented greater difficulties of construction, or occasioned a greater outlay of capital, than the parent line, yet the original shareholders realized high profits; and when the public saw that all the practical difficulties of the Railway system were overcome, and that the three first lines that were executed yielded large profits, they rushed headlong into a course of wild speculation, which was attended with the most ruinous consequences. The following account of the panic which ensued is given by Mr. Scrivenor:—

“The early struggles for existence which every new-born system has to endure in this country, have already been brought under notice. These past and overcome, then came the wild burst of popular feeling in its favour, at a season (1845) when many combined causes prevailed to induce an over-estimate of its value. The public had witnessed the success of those who were the first proprietors of shares in the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, the Grand Junction Railway, and the London and Birmingham. Dazzled by the profits that had been received from these undertakings, they eagerly grasped at original shares in new lines, deeming the same success awaited them. The results and consequences are well known. Many were ruined! because in those days, when giddy speculation of all sorts abounded, men bought shares at an advanced premium in a line not even commenced. Then succeeded a reaction most lamentable in its effect, prostrating at once those who had been blinded by the illusive prosperity of the period, and retarding the advancement of good *bona fide* projects. The public omitted in their calculations the element of *Time*; and it does not follow, that because a line, without even a rail laid upon it, or a barrowful of earth removed from its surface, was wrongly valued at a premium in 1845; yet that same line, in *due time*, will have struggled through the infancy of its construction, and will yield to its promoters a goodly dividend; *then*, but not till then, can the premium it is worth be truly computed.

“The vicissitudes of the period did not end here. The public became alarmed, and panic after panic followed in quick succession, reducing to a nominal value the better class of shares. Scarcely had these panics commenced their destructive influence in the railway world, when the mercantile world suffered calamitous reverses—so intimate are the relations of property. Commercial men, to meet their engagements, sold the railway stock they possessed, reducing, by their sales, to a lower level, this depressed property. Times did not mend; the pressure upon the money market increased; and convulsion after convulsion rent and struck the delicate fabric of commercial credit. The huge structure at last gave way, and, in its crash, seemed to involve all in one common ruin. The bitter storm blew round the world; for England's stability is the keystone in the arch of commerce,

and that touched and shaken, quickly spread a baneful influence over every colonial market, and, indeed, more or less, over every market in the known world."—*Introduction*, p. 20.

When the country had begun to recover from this railway paralysis, the revolutionary movement, which began to agitate Europe in February 1848, added to the virulence of the original disease. Trade and manufactures everywhere languished. Commerce was consequently paralyzed, and railway property almost threatened with destruction. When Governments were crushed in a day, and kings driven into exile, and ministers compelled to seek for shelter from popular fury, every interest in Europe, personal and national, mercantile and political, could not fail to suffer. When foreign railways were broken up by a lawless rabble; when the lower classes, whom the laws of God and of social life had doomed to labour, sought to divide the property which the industry of honest minds and of skilful hands had accumulated; and when these social evils threatened to extend themselves into our own happy and contented land, it was not to be wondered at that railway enterprise suffered an instantaneous collapse, and that railway property almost lost its value.

Notwithstanding these severe checks, the British capitalist never despaired. He relied on the knowledge and character of his fellow-subjects, and on the power and firmness of the Government; and the Railway system steadily advanced, though with impaired means and clouded hopes. The following details from the Parliamentary Returns will exhibit the successive steps of its progress, and its condition at the commencement of the present year:—

In 1843, the number of miles of railway opened at the middle of the year were—

	1857 miles.	Increase.
In 1844, at January 1st,	1952	95 miles.
1845,	2148	196
1846,	2441	293
1847,	3036	595
1848,	3870	834
1849,	5007	1137

The regular extension of the Railway system, as exhibited in this table, does not shew the influence of the panic of 1845. This, however, will appear from the following statement:—

Previous to December 31, 1843, Parliament had authorized the opening of 2285 miles of railway, and every one of these has been executed.

In 1844, 805 miles were authorized, and of these only 21 miles remain to be executed.

These results shew the healthy state of railway speculation

previous to 1845, and the power of the shareholders to fulfil their obligations.

In 1845, however, no fewer than 2700 miles were authorized by Parliament; and of these, at the present moment, 1298, or nearly *one-half*, are yet unexecuted!

In 1846, the mania was at its height, and 4538 miles were sanctioned by the Legislature. Of these, 4056 miles, or nearly 8-9ths, are yet unexecuted.

In 1847, when the paroxysm of speculation had begun to subside, 1354 miles of railway were authorized by Parliament; and 1300 remain to be executed, the Companies having found the means only to complete 54 miles, or 1-25th of the whole.

In 1848, only 330 miles were authorized, and not a single mile of these has been executed.

According to these Returns we are almost entitled to infer that the Railway system, as carried on in this country by private enterprise, has reached its limits,—that is, that it will not extend beyond the system of authorized lines. How far it may reach that limit the following statement of the Railway Commissioners will enable us to conjecture:—

“There can then be little doubt that a very large proportion of the authorized railways will not be completed, although no estimate can at present be formed of the extent likely to be abandoned. The time for the completion of nearly the whole of the lines authorized in 1845 and 1846, which are not in progress, has been extended by the Commissioners by the Act above referred to, (11 Vict. cap. 3, passed in December 1847,) as applications for such extension are under their consideration. And at present it can only be considered that about 35 miles of the lines authorized in 1845, and about 415 miles of those authorized in 1846, are abandoned; but from the financial statements published by *thirteen* of the principal Companies, it *appears probable that not less than 1260 miles*, in addition to the above, (1710 in all,) may be abandoned. When it is remembered by how few Companies these statements have been made, it is not perhaps too much to assume that *one-half* of the 4800 miles of authorized railways, of which the works are not in progress, will never be completed under the existing Acts of Parliament.”—*Report of the Railway Commissioners, 1848.* Part II. pp. vi. vii. Dated May 1, 1849.

Our readers will now be anxious to know the nature and extent of the traffic possessed by these railways, and the pecuniary returns which it has yielded.

Years.	Number of Passengers.	Receipts from Passengers.
1843, . . .	23,466,896, . . .	£3,110,257
1844, . . .	27,763,602, . . .	3,439,294
1845, . . .	33,791,253, . . .	3,976,341
1846, . . .	48,796,983, . . .	4,725,216
1847, . . .	51,352,163, . . .	5,149,002
1848, . . .	57,965,070, . . .	5,720,382

It appears from this table, that though the number of miles of railway opened in 1848 was more than double of that opened in 1843, and though the number of passengers had increased in a still greater proportion, yet the receipts were not nearly double, being only as 57 to 31, a result which must have arisen either from the passengers having travelled a shorter distance, or from their having travelled in carriages of a lower class—results arising, doubtless, from the state of the country.

In the table of the Goods Traffic the result is widely different :—

Years.	Receipts from Goods.	Total Receipts from Goods and Passengers.
1843, . . .	£1,424,932,	£4,535,189
1844, . . .	1,635,380,	5,074,674
1845, . . .	2,233,373,	6,209,714
1846, . . .	2,846,353,	7,565,569
1847, . . .	7,362,884,	8,510,886
1848, . . .	4,213,169,	9,933,551

This table is a most important one, as it proves that, while the railway lines have been little more than doubled, or have been increased in the ratio of 18·6 to 38·7, the receipts from goods have been increased *three times*, in the ratio of 14 to 42 ; so that the total receipts have increased at a greater ratio than the number of miles, namely, as 45 to 99.

In order to learn what classes of society contribute to the support of the Railway system, and in what proportion, we shall take the year from 30th June 1847 to 30th June 1848, the number of miles that were open at the beginning of this period being 3507, and the number open at the end of it, 4357 :—

	Passengers.	Receipts.
First Class, . . .	7,190,779	£1,792,533
Second Class, . . .	21,690,509	2,353,153
Third Class, . . .	15,241,529	661,038
Parliamentary Class, . .	13,092,489	902,851
Mixed, . . .	749,763	11,807
<hr/>		
Total, . . .	57,965,069	£5,721,382
Receipts from goods, cattle, parcels, &c., . .		4,213,179
<hr/>		
Total Receipts for the year 1847-1848, . .		£9,934,561

It appears from this table that the middle classes of society are the best contributors to railways. The number of that class who travel in second class carriages being *three times* greater than those who travel in first class carriages, and the receipts from that class being greater in the ratio of 18 to 24.

The same returns for the half-year ending December 31st 1848, give a very favourable view of the progress of the system.

The number of miles open at the beginning of that half-year was 4443, and the number open at the end of it, 5079. These 5079 are distributed as follows :—

Railways in England,	.	.	.	3918
„ in Scotland,	.	.	.	728
„ in Ireland,	.	.	.	261
		Passengers.		Receipts.
First Class,	.	3,743,602	.	£1,003,516
Second Class,	.	12,191,549	.	1,360,468
Third Class,	.	7,184,032	.	320,862
Parliamentary Class,	.	8,450,623	.	597,071
Mixed,	.	60,485	.	1,382
Total,	.	31,630,291	.	£3,283,299
Receipts from goods, cattle, parcels, &c.,	.		.	2,461,662

Total Receipts for half-year ending Dec. 31st 1848, £5,744,961

It is obvious from this table, compared with the preceding, that the second class passengers have increased in a greater ratio than the others.

Taking the average number of miles open during the half-year at 4756, the receipts for each mile would average £1208. On the following principal lines this average differs greatly :—

On the London and North Western, it is	£2625
Edinburgh and Glasgow,	„ 1853
Great Western,	„ 1795
Lancashire and Yorkshire,	„ 1681
South Eastern,	1675
London, Brighton, and South Coast,	1657
Midland,	„ 1385
South Western,	„ 1341
Eastern Counties,	„ 1298
York, Newcastle, and Berwick,	1170
Caledonian,	„ 837
York and North Midland,	„ 723
„ Eastern Union,	„ 700
„ Great Southern and Western of	
Ireland,	„ 592

In their latest Report the Railway Commissioners have endeavoured to estimate the amount of money expended on the construction of railways :—

“ The returns which will enable them to do this accurately are being received by them, and will, on their completion, be laid before Parliament. They believe, however, that the expenditure in 1848 was less than that in 1847, but nearly as large as the expenditure in 1846 ; that at the end of 1848, rather more than £200,000,000 (*two hundred millions*) had been expended on Railways ; that the Companies retained power to expend upon authorized Railways £140,000,000,

(one hundred and forty millions,) and that the extension of time which has been granted to so many Companies, will allow this expenditure to be distributed over five or six years. But it has already been stated, that it appears probable that a large proportion of the lines not now in progress, will never be completed; and if it be assumed that at least one-half of the lines which are not in progress will be entirely abandoned, it may also be assumed that £50,000,000 (fifty millions) of authorized capital will not be required."—Report for 1848, Part ii. p. 7.

Hence it follows, that in four or five years the sum expended on railways will amount to nearly £300,000,000, or three hundred millions of money. This enormous outlay exhibits in a striking view the disposition of capitalists to invest their money in railways; and the Railway Commissioners justly observe, that a number of these capitalists entered into the speculation not for permanent investment, but to increase their capital by an exercise of their judgment;—that it is to their "enterprising spirit that the rapid spread of railways over the country, in spite of the difficulties offered by local oppositions and parliamentary forms, is to be attributed;"—and that it is "to the energy, commercial knowledge, and habits of business of these men that the public are indebted for the prompt development of a system of railway management adapted to the wants of the community."

The conflicting interests of different classes of shareholders, namely, of those who invest their money temporarily and permanently, and also of those who hold privileged descriptions of stock, and those who do not, have for a long time rendered it advisable that the financial supervision of Railway Companies should be entrusted to some department of the Government, such as the *Railway Board*. Mr. Edward Strutt, when at the head of that Board, introduced into his Bill of 1847 a provision that Railway Companies should, when called upon, make returns to the Commissioners of their receipts, expenditure, and accounts, in such a form as should be directed, for the purpose of ascertaining their accuracy. The absolute necessity of establishing some effectual mode of directing the financial accounts of Companies by an independent authority, which should command the confidence of shareholders and the public, has been exhibited in the recent exposure of the disgraceful transactions which have been detected in the management of the affairs of the York and North Midland, of the York, Newcastle, and Berwick, and of the Eastern Counties' Railways; and a select Committee of the House of Lords was appointed to consider and report upon this subject. In order to carry into effect the valuable suggestions of this Committee, a Bill has been introduced into Parliament by Lord Montagu, under the name of

The Audit of Railway Accounts' Bill, which, we trust, will soon pass into a law. The shareholders of Railway Stock, and the public who may desire to invest their gains in it, have a deep interest in the passing of this Bill, and ought to take the usual steps for securing so great a boon; but it is very probable that the Directors of Railway Companies will not, without a struggle, surrender their power into the hands of Government. A meeting, indeed, was held a few days ago, on the 9th July, for the purpose of organizing an opposition to the Audit Bill; and the Chairmen of several of the principal English Companies, with Lord Lonsdale at their head, passed resolutions condemnatory of the Bill.* Not only was it represented as inquisitorial, vexatious, and oppressive, but it was argued by Lord Lonsdale, that it would be used as an instrument by Government for purchasing Railway property on the most advantageous terms. By the Act of 7th and 8th Victoria, Government have the power of purchasing any Railway, under certain conditions; and Lord Lonsdale conjectures that the power of appointing their own accountants under the Bill, will allow Government to make out the accounts according to their own wishes, so as to enable them to buy up Railway property on terms the most advantageous to themselves! Had such a sentiment emanated from a chartist or a radical shareholder, we could have found an apology for it in ignorance and political malignity; but it does surprise us that a Conservative Peer should suppose it possible that a board of English gentlemen should, either with or without any motive of self-interest, be considered capable of such misconduct. We trust that the Government will avail themselves of the power of purchasing so wisely given them by the Legislature; and we trust we shall live to see the day when the whole railways in the kingdom will be under their disinterested supervision and able management.†

An interesting feature in the Railway system of Britain is the union of a number of Railways by amalgamation, purchase, or lease. Parliament has wisely provided that no powers of purchase, sale, lease, or amalgamation shall be given to any Railway Company, unless, previous to their application to Parliament, they shall have respectively paid up one-half of the capital authorized to be raised by any previous Acts, by means of shares, and shall have applied it to the purposes of their undertaking. A return of such amalgamations was printed by order of the

* A meeting of the London and North-Western, on the 17th, came to a similar resolution.

† Our readers will find some admirable observations relative to this matter, in the Railway Report of 1846, Part ii., p. vii., viii., and ix., and also in the Introduction to Mr. Scrivenor's Work, pages 16, 17, and 18.

House of Commons in July 1848. It exhibits in different columns the length of each individual line, the Company to which it originally belonged, the nature of the transfer to which it has been subject, whether by amalgamation, purchase, or lease, the names of the Companies amalgamated, the date of amalgamation, the name of the Company purchasing, and the date of the purchase, and the name of the Company taking the lease, with the date of its commencement and expiration. This return is illustrated by two beautiful maps, one of Great Britain, and one of Ireland, shewing to the eye the amalgamation of Railways—the existing lines—and those in progress. The map of Great Britain is more than three feet long and two broad, and displays in a very interesting manner the great ganglions, or condensed groups of Railways which cluster round the foci of manufactures and commerce, stretching from York to Liverpool, and surrounding Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield, and Manchester—thickening again between Sheffield and Lincoln, and within the wide space inclosing Mansfield, Derby, Nottingham, Stafford, Birmingham, Rugby, and Leicester. Another ganglion appears to the south and east of Newcastle and Durham; and one still larger to the south south-east and south-west of Glasgow. We regret to see the lines so widely separated even in some parts of England, and such large blank spaces in Scotland and Ireland; but we are sanguine enough to believe that a long time will not elapse till the traffic of these important regions is developed in England by new railways;—in Scotland by a great trunk line from Perth to Inverness and Thurso, and by tributary branches and single lines to the north and west,*—and in Ireland by similar constructions.†

Before concluding our general notice of the physical and commercial character of our Railway system, we must notice the comparative expenses which have been incurred in England, and in foreign countries. In favourable situations, English Railways, with

* Besides those for which Acts have been obtained, the following are some of the most important secondary lines required in Scotland:—1. From Hawick to Langholm and Longtown, to join the Caledonian. 2. From Girvan to Portpatrick. 3. From the Perth and Inverness trunk to Killin, Tyndrum, and Oban. 4. From Dunblane to Callander and Tyndrum. 5. From Castle-Douglas to Dalmellington. 6. From Kirkeudbright to Portpatrick by Newton-Stewart. 7. From Dalwhinnie to Fortwilliam, &c. &c.

† At the time we are writing (July 18th) we observe that Parliament has given a loan of £500,000 to complete the Great Trunk Line across Ireland, from Dublin to Galway, by Mullingar and Athlone; so that when the line at Mullingar by the Midland and Great Western is joined to Longford and Clones, through Cavan by a new line, and Clones to Lifford by the Dundalk and Enniskillen, and the Enniskillen and Londonderry now in progress, and the line then completed from Lifford to Londonderry—Ireland will be singularly favoured by a Great Trunk Line cutting it in two from West to East by the Dublin and Galway Line, and by the great sinuous line running from south to north, from Waterford to Londonderry, touching Loch Erne on the western coast, and joining by secondary lines Coleraine, Belfast, Downpatrick, Newry, Dundalk, and Drogheda, with Dublin.

double lines of rails, have been constructed for £10,000 per mile. When the localities have been very unfavourable, they have cost as much as £50,000 per mile. Between these two extremes we have all varieties of expenditure per mile. Mr. Lecount* has computed that a Railway 80 miles long which cost £960,000, or £12,000 per mile, which will rarely happen, would require the following traffic per day from each end to pay the annexed dividends:—

Tons of Goods per day.		Passengers per day.	Dividend.
75	or	120	$\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.
100	or	160	1 "
125	or	200	$1\frac{3}{4}$ "
200	or	320	$4\frac{1}{2}$ "

Or taking into account a traffic composed of both passengers and goods, the calculation would stand thus:

Tons of Goods per day.		Passengers per day.	Dividend.
35	and	60	$\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.
50	and	80	1 "
62	and	100	$1\frac{3}{4}$ "
100	and	160	$4\frac{1}{2}$ "

It seldom happens that in this country a mile of Railway can be executed at so low a rate as £12,000 per mile.

"The Americans," says M. Lecount, "have such facilities for their constructions, that 1600 miles of Railroad have been made in that country (a good deal of it however being only *single line*) at an annual cost of only £5081 per mile; whereas, in England, the mere permanent way alone would amount to £4400 per mile, if the rails were 45 lbs. to the yard, and laid upon longitudinal timbers; £4900 per mile, if laid with rails 42 lbs. per yard, having chain and cast iron supports between them on longitudinal timbers; £5300 per mile with rails 42 lbs. per yard on blocks three feet apart; £4800 per mile with the same sized rails on wooden sleepers; £5600 per mile with 62 lb. rails on blocks four feet apart, and £5100 for the same rails on wooden sleepers; £6000 per mile for rails of 75 lbs. per yard, on blocks five feet apart; and £5500 per mile for the same on sleepers. These prices do not include laying the way, ballasting, and draining. Thus we see that the mere cost of the permanent way in this country, averaging £5200 per mile, exceeds that of the whole expense of a complete railway in America; and 75 lbs. rails, on blocks, and sleepers, including laying, ballasting, sidings, turn plates, and every expense, has exceeded £8000 per mile."—*Ency. Brit., Art. Railway*, p. 16.

The average expense of £5081 per mile employed by Mr. Lecount, in the preceding extract, agrees very nearly with the following statement mentioned by Mr. French, the member for

* *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. RAILWAY, p. 16.

Roscommon county, in the discussion on Irish Railways in the House of Commons on the 9th of July :—

	Per Mile.
Columbia and Philadelphia, . . .	£10,000
Boston and Worcester, . . .	7,700
Western, . . .	7,300
Camden and Amboy, . . .	4,100
Utica, . . .	3,600
Richmond, . . .	3,600
Florida, . . .	3,200
Auburn, . . .	2,900
South Carolina, . . .	2,600
Average, . . .	£5000

In Prussia, a comprehensive system of railways, to the extent of 3200 miles, was planned by the Government, with its usual wisdom and liberality; but up to 1845, 652 miles only were completed, as shewn in the following table—the political disturbances in 1848 and 1849 having doubtless prevented the execution of the general plan :—

	Length of Line in Miles.	Cost.
Berlin and Anhalt, . . .	93½	£726,873
Berlin and Potsdam, . . .	16	210,000
Berlin and Stettin, . . .	83	783,000
Berlin and Frankfort on Oder, . . .	49½	420,000
Lower Silesian, { . . .	131	1,200,000
Upper Silesian, } * . . .	49½	630,000
Breslau and Schweidnitz, . . .	37	285,000
Magdeburg and Leipsic, . . .	67½	615,000
Magdeburg and Halberstadt, . . .	35½	286,155
Düsseldorf and Elberfeld, . . .	16	304,170
Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle, . . .	52	1,425,000
Cologne and Bonn, . . .	18½	131,000
Total, . . .	652	£7,017,198

According to this table, the average cost of the Prussian lines is about £10,000 per mile.

The following table shews the length and cost of each of the lines formed in Austria :—

	Length in Miles.	Cost.
Linz Gmunden Budweis, . . .	119	£742,000
Emperor Ferdinand's line, . . .	179	1,700,000
Vienna to Glognitz, . . .	46	1,050,000

* The Government have guaranteed 3½ per cent. to the Companies.

	Length in Miles.	Cost.
Olmütz and Prague,	151	£1,843,725
Murzuschlag and Gratz, .	57½	not given
Total, .	495	£4,936,325

These lines show an average of about £11,300 per mile.

The small States of Germany have executed the following lines of railway, 541 miles in length, of which 371 miles belong to the Government :—

	Length in Miles.	Cost.
*Baden, .	96	£1,704,036
*Brunswick and Hanover, .	38	209,707
*Brunswick and Oscherleben, .	43	240,000
*Brunswick and Harzburg, .	27½	127,500
Hamburg to Bergstorf, .	10½	191,332
Altona to Kiel, .	64	382,500
Leipsic to Dresden, .	71½	975,000
*Saxon Bavarian, .	51	900,000
Taunus Railway, .	28	291,661
*Munich to Augsburg, .	37½	350,000
*Louis, Southern and Northern, .	70	4,286,500
Nuremberg and Furth, .	4	17,708
Total, .	541	£9,676,249

The average cost of these lines will be about £19,000 per mile.

After these details regarding foreign railways, our readers will scarcely give credit to the following statement regarding the expense *per mile* of English railways :—

	Per Mile.
Blackwall Railway, . . .	£289,930
Croydon, . . .	80,400
Manchester and Bury, . . .	70,000
Manchester and Leeds, . . .	64,588
Manchester and Birmingham, . . .	61,624
Brighton, . . .	56,981
Manchester and Sheffield, . . .	56,316
Eastern Counties, . . .	46,855
Great Western, . . .	46,870
South Eastern, . . .	44,412
North Western, . . .	41,612

Leaving out the Blackwall Railway, which would make an average of the expense of the preceding lines ridiculous, the average expense of the remaining ones, per mile, is, £56,915!

The lines marked * were executed at the expense of the Government.

Some idea of the cause of apparently such profligate expenditure may be formed from the following facts :—

	Per Mile.
Parliamentary Expenses of the Blackwall Railway, .	£14,414
„ „ „ Eastern Counties, .	886
„ „ „ Manchester and Birmingham, .	5,190
„ „ „ Brighton, .	4,806

The following sums, per mile, were paid for land :—

	Per Mile.
Manchester and Birmingham, .	£16,262
Eastern Counties,	15,881
Brighton,	10,105
Average per mile,	14,088

So little is known in this country concerning foreign railways, that we were anxious to have supplied the defect, by copious details respecting their history and statistics, and by comparing them with our own in reference to the cost of their construction and maintenance—the accommodation of passengers, and their receipts and prospects; but though we have collected much information on the subject, our restricted space will not allow us to give it in detail. We shall therefore content ourselves with such an abstract of the more important particulars as our limits will permit. The following Table contains a general view of the Railway system in Germany :—

Names of the States.	English mile constructed	English mile in project.	English miles to be constructed	English mile Total.
Austria,	716½	229	158½	1103
Prussia,	677½	403	794	1874
Duchy of Anhalt,	39½	12½	—	52
Kingdom of Saxony,	176	148	7	331
Duchy of Saxe,	137½	43½	87	144
Bavaria,	149	308½	174½	632
Wurtemberg,	24	148	32	204
Grand Duchy of Baden,	154½	35½	—	195
Do. of Hesse Darmstadt,	34½	43½	40	118
Duchy of Nassau,	27	—	—	27
Francfort-on-Main,	2	14	—	16
Electorate of Hesse,	„	178	4	182
Duchy of Brunswick,	73	—	7	80
Hanover,	59	154	161	374
Hanseatic Towns,	0	—	2½	11
Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg,	46	—	94½	140½
Holstein and Lauenburg,	96	31	48½	170½
Total,	2294	1748½	1505½	5637½

The total number of miles thus projected in all Germany is not much greater than the number now executed in England.

We have now before us a very interesting Table of French Railways in 1847, with the minutest details, occupying thirteen separate columns, and showing the expense of all the different varieties of work necessary for their completion. We must confine ourselves, however, to a brief abstract.*

Names of the Lines.	Length in Kilo- meters actually constructed.	Total Expense.	Expense per English Mile.
† St. Etienne to Anvrezieux,	21.25	£2,996,503	£144,296
Do. to Lyons,	56.69	21,182,873	373,643
Branch to Montand, . . .	"	399,549	"
† Anvrezieux to Roanne, . .	67.00	12,500,000	186,587
† The Garde Line, Nismes, &c.,	92.32	18,914,368	204,876
Paris to St. Germain, . . .	18.47	16,413,139	888,830
Atmospherical Branch, . .	2.00	4,689,835	"
† Anzin to Denain and Abscon,	15.56	2,818,202	181,083
† Montpellier to Cette, . .	27.35	4,509,134	164,885
Paris to Versailles,* . . .	19.50	17,055,722	874,652
Do. to do.	16.89	16,855,301	998,005
† Bordeaux to La Teste, . .	52.31	5,987,773	114,471
† Alsace { Mullhouts to	15.00	2,869,096	191,273
{ Strasburg to Basle,	140.50	44,953,618	319,955
Paris { Orleans }	132.69	59,652,779	449,531
{ Corbeil }			
Paris to Rouen,	131.31	64,589,384	494,169
Rouen to Havre,	91.00	56,560,316	621,542
Montpellier to Nismes, . .	52.00	16,519,605	317,685
† Paris to Sceaux,	10.45	4,740,120	453,754
The Northern Line,	334.90	135,476,337	404,528

The following lines have been opened in France between 1847 and August 1849 :—

	Kilom.		Kilom.
Paris to Tronnerre,	185	Amiens to Boulogne,	124
— to Troyes,	182	Marseilles to Avignon, .	123
Orleans to Saumur,	171	Rouen to Dieppe,	70
— to Bourges,	112	Vierzon to Chateauroux,	63

—making about 1360 English miles in all France.

The lines in Belgium constructed by the State amount to 347 miles, and cost £5,945,148. They unite Brussels with Ostend, Bruges, Ghent, Antwerp, Malines, Courtray, Lille, Tournay, Donay, Valenciennes, Mons, Charleroi, Namur, Mariembourg, Liège, and Aix-la-Chapelle.

In Holland, there are railways joining Amsterdam with Rotterdam, 50 miles ; and with Utrecht and Arnheim, 60 miles.

* The lines marked † are only single lines.

In the north of Italy, a line partly finished passes from Venice to Turin and Alessandria, by Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, Milan, and Novara; and one from Milan to Monza. There is also a line from Florence to Leghorn through Pisa, and to Pontedera; another from Pisa to Lucca and St. Salvatore, and another from Florence to Prato.

In the south of Italy, there is a railway from Naples to Pompeii and Castellamare, and another from Naples to Caserta and Capua; but no line has been projected in the States of the Church. The Pope, indeed, is said to have objected to their introduction.

There is a railway in Switzerland twenty-five English miles in length from Zurich to Dietiken and Baden; and even in Spain, a railway $17\frac{3}{4}$ English miles in length has been recently opened from Barcelona to Mataro.

The most eastern railways in Europe terminate at Warsaw and Cracow. A line is in progress to Bochnia, east of Cracow, and another from Pesth to Debretzin, still farther east.

The Swedish Government have exhibited great practical wisdom in the encouragement they have given to the formation of railways. The State guarantees to the projectors four per cent. for fifteen years; and the pecuniary loans given by Government are not to be repaid till after ten years, and then they are only to be exacted from one-half of the surplus profits above six per cent. If the State resolves to purchase the lines, they cannot do so till after twenty years, and they must then pay a bonus of 25 per cent. In place of a tax being exacted by the State, as in British railways, and exorbitant local rates, the Government gives for nothing the portions of the crown-lands through which the lines may pass, and also the labour of soldiers, paupers, and convicts, at reduced wages. The Government has also agreed to erect electric telegraphs at their own expense.

The liberal conduct of the Swedish and other Governments to Railway enterprise forms a singular contrast with that of Great Britain. When the early Railway Companies were receiving large dividends, it was not to be wondered at that Government, in its necessities, should impose some tax upon their exorbitant profits, and that the parochial authorities should imitate their example. In the present state of railway property, however, these burthens are intolerable, and cannot with any propriety be much longer imposed. The London and North-Western Company have paid during the last year the sum of £50,505 for government duty, and £58,650 for local rates and taxes. In the half-year just ended, the London and South-Western Company have paid for local rates alone £10,833, which is upwards of 11 per cent. on their balance available for a dividend!

This tax, consisting chiefly of poor's rate, is so unjust and oppressive that Parliament ought instantly to redress the grievance. In this last case every adult employed by the Company is taxed £12, 10s. per annum, while the average impost on the male population of the country is only 30s. per head.

The following table shows the taxes imposed upon railways for the year 1848 :—

	Government Duty.		Rates and Taxes.	
London and North-Western, .	£50,505	8 0	£58,649	15 10
Great Western,	29,603	18 8	38,555	5 2
Midland,	23,043	10 5	33,125	13 2
Eastern Counties,	16,817	5 1	24,754	3 8
London, Brighton, and South Coast,	16,376	5 0	22,834	3 5
London and South-Western, .	15,033	5 0	19,491	9 6
South-Eastern,	14,895	9 1	24,367	18 10
York and North Midland, . .	7,092	14 1	13,960	18 2
York, Newcastle, and Berwick,	6,571	9 3	14,513	17 1
Lancashire and Yorkshire, .	4,336	10 4	16,793	10 2
London and Blackwall, . . .	2,363	11 6	2,209	13 7
South Devon,	2,131	6 5	2,017	1 10
East Lancashire,	1,906	18 1	2,695	14 1
Birkenhead, Lancashire, & Cheshire,	1,602	15 3	457	12 10
Manchester, Sheffield & Lincoln- shire, }	1,172	19 3	3,423	0 5

Railways have not made much progress in our Colonies and dependencies. They have been checked by the same causes which operated in every part of Europe. The East India Company have guaranteed to the Great Indian Peninsular Company a dividend of 5 per cent. upon £500,000, a sum which is supposed capable of completing the first thirty-five miles of the line, from Bombay to Callian; and the 11th and 12th Victoria, cap. 13, guarantees 4 per cent. for loans for the construction of railways in the West Indies and Mauritius. A number of railway acts, passed by the legislatures of the Colonies of British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica, Ceylon, New Brunswick, and Canada, have been reported upon by the Railway Commissioners to the Colonial Office. Colonial acts have also been passed, in 1847 and 1848, for incorporating the Nova Scotia Electrical Telegraph Company and the British North American Electro-Magnetic Telegraph Association.

In their latest Report, dated 1st May 1849, the Railway Commissioners have made a special reference to "the great change that has taken place in public opinion with respect to the value of Railway investments." During the year 1848, consols rose about 4 per cent., while the average price of investments in five

of the principal Railway Companies fell about 20 per cent., and hence the Commissioners justly conclude that there may be much difficulty in obtaining capital for many of the proposed lines. This decline is shewn in the following statement :—

London & N. Western.	London & S. Western.	Great Western.	Midland.	Average.	Consols.	
184	184	146	130	148½	89	July 3, 1847.
150	102	112	109	118½	85½	Jan. 1, 1848.
120	92	95	100	101½	84	July 1, 1848.
124	80	91	85	95	88½	Dec. 30, 1848.
133	76	95	76	95	92	April 20, 1849.

After perusing these details, the reader will naturally ask, What are the future prospects of railways as commercial speculations, as these prospects may be gathered from the facts now before us, and without any reference to the development of the whole traffic of the country, or the future measures of Government? Three writers, whose opinions are entitled to considerable weight, have taken different views of the future prospects of Railway Companies. After quoting the following passage from Sir Francis Head's interesting pamphlet, Mr. Scrivenor speaks with hope, and even assurance, respecting the probable success of the Railway system :—

"In Herapath's *Railway Journal* of the 30th September last, it appears that the capital expended on railways now open for traffic, amounting to £148,000,000, (one hundred and forty-eight millions,) gives a profit of 1.81 per cent. for the half-year, or £3, 12s. 4½d. per cent. per annum. Deducting the non-paying dividend lines, the dividend on the remainder amounts to 2.09 per cent. for the half-year, or £4, 3s. 7½d. per cent. per annum.

"After ten years' competition with railways, the dividends received by the Canal Companies between London and Manchester were in 1846 as follows :—

Grand Junction Canal,	.	.	.	6 per cent.
Oxford,	.	.	.	26 "
Coventry,	.	.	.	25 "
Old Birmingham,	.	.	.	16 "
Trent and Mersey,	.	.	.	30 "
Duke of Bridgewater's (private property), say	.	.	.	30 "

"The dividends received by the Grand Junction Canal for the last forty years have averaged £9, 10s. 9d. per cent. per annum."—*Stokers and Pokers*, pp. 188, 154.

Upon this statement Mr. Scrivenor makes the following observations :—

"I hail these results of traffic as proving beyond question the future prosperity of the railways of the United Kingdom. Observe the result of traffic on canals, what rich dividends they have yielded to their proprietors; this, too, without the aid of passenger traffic. Now

that we have evidently entered upon a new epoch in the world's history, when the multitudes require to be provided with swift transit—when those who in no other epoch ever dreamt of travelling, now move about in masses—there is legitimate reason for concluding that that grand system by which the many are enabled to 'run to and fro' with facility and ease, must in the end prosper beyond all former precedent. The railways have infused throughout the dense ranks of our population a quickening impulse for locomotion; they have kindled a taste in the public mind that will increase more and more;—who shall tell its bounds? But this we know, that this disposition to travel about on the part of the public must be productive of excessive prosperity to those who are possessed of railway property; it cannot be indulged without benefiting them; and according to the measure of its increase, so may be measured the railway dividends in years to come."—*The Railways of the United Kingdom, &c.*, Introduction, pp. 22, 23.

These views are doubtless very sanguine. We trust they will be realized, though under existing arrangements we do not perceive that they rest on any solid foundation.

Mr. Alexander Gordon, the author of the pamphlet on the "Past and Present Views of Railways," has taken a very different view of the future prospects of railways. He confesses that he is the only member of the Institution of Civil Engineers who has entertained, and still entertains, opinions adverse to the introduction and progress of the Railway system; but the singularity of his position may perhaps be explained by the fact that he was almost the only engineer who advocated the superiority of steam coaches on common roads to railways, and who continued to plead for them even after experience had refused its concurrence. But, however this may be, Mr. Gordon has been a consistent enemy of railways as now constructed, and has since 1833 continued to predict their failure, and to assert "that a short time will see the general Railway system deprecated as commercially, agriculturally, and politically hurtful." The following are the grounds upon which Mr. Gordon rests this gloomy foreboding of railway adversity:—

"Railway travelling," says he, "has not increased so much since I wrote as to make it more than 30,000,000 of passengers carried thirty miles per annum by railway companies. These companies have expended considerably more than £200,000,000, the annual interest of which, at five per cent., amounts to £10,000,000, just 2½d., or 2½d. nearly for a passenger per mile, and this is part only of the total sum to be debited to the transport account in railway profit and loss. Thus it will be seen that the passengers are carried at a much lower mean price than is required to cover the interest alone.

"The grand profit and loss account of railways in June 1848 may be thus stated:—

Dr.

To interest at 5 per cent. on a capital of £200,000,000, sterling,	£10,000,000
Working expenses estimated by railway authorities at 40 per cent. as per contra,	3,973,420
	<hr/> £13,973,420

Cr.

By total amount received for passengers, parcels, and goods in year ending 30th June 1848, as returned by the Commissioners of Railways,	£9,933,550
Balance, being the loss on this year's business, <i>without making any allowance for the replacement of capital</i> ,	4,039,870
	<hr/> £13,973,420

"But railway partisans will reply that lines might have been made for much less, and that one-half of the capital has been sunk, and that the value of the property is now considered to be only £100,000,000.

Total receipts for a year,	£9,933,000
The interest is	£5,000,000
And working expenses,	3,973,000
	<hr/> 8,973,000

The profit for the year would then only be .£960,000

"Thus the grand railway account would not show quite ONE PER CENT. per annum from which to pay dividends. And still there is *no provision made for replacement of capital.*"—*Past and Present Views of Railways.* Pp. 16-18.

We have neither space nor inclination to point out the fallacies which mark these two opposite views of the condition of railway property. It will be more instructive to inquire into the causes that have produced its admitted depreciation, and to point out the means by which the Railway system may be made permanently beneficial to the public, without any loss to the present shareholders.

The original promoters of the Railway system—the men of sanguine temperament and enlarged views, who boldly risked their all in its establishment, and who have been compelled to dispose of their shares at a great loss, are like soldiers who have fallen in the defence of their country. They have discharged a great duty to the community, and its applause, posthumous or contemporary, is now their only reward. In estimating, therefore, the value of railway property, we must consider it as represented by the existing state of the share market; and considering the present condition of the *plant*, as it is called, including all the

machinery at work, we cannot estimate it at much more than £75,000,000. If we suppose that the working expenses can, by economy, be reduced to £3,000,000, or a little more than 30 per cent., we shall have an annual profit of £3,243,000, or nearly a dividend of $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. This, however, is a very inadequate return. Let us see what are the prospects of its being very considerably increased, under different *possible* conditions of the Railway system.

1. If we suppose, with the Railway Commissioners—and the supposition is a very reasonable one, and probably under the truth—that of the 7005 miles of *authorized* railways that remain to be opened, 2160 miles are in progress, and that out of the remaining 4800 one-half may never be completed under existing acts, we shall have new lines to the extent of $2160 + 2400$, or 4560 miles opened in the course of three or four years; that is, the present railway system will be nearly doubled, being equal to $5005 + 4560$, or 9565 miles. The influence of these new lines upon the prosperity of *existing railways* cannot be questioned. Some of these new lines may indeed be rivals to a certain degree to some of the old ones, and to that extent these old ones must suffer; but, generally speaking, every new mile of railway that is executed must operate to a certain extent as a feeder to all but its immediate rival. The passion for locomotion excited and gratified by a railway passing through an unopened district, and the traffic which it necessarily produces, must, more or less, benefit every railway in the kingdom. When the Irish population are conducted to the east coast of Ireland, they will necessarily pass into Britain, and contribute to the prosperity of the Scotch and English lines. Irish produce, too, in place of being carried by sea round the dangerous headlands of its north and south coasts, will find a quicker and a readier path into the Scotch and English markets. The same observations apply to new and unopened lines in Scotland, Wales, and different parts of England. An increase in the value of existing railway property must necessarily take place from the completion of the 4560 miles to which we have referred.

But while these advantages must certainly accrue to railway investments from the development of passenger and goods traffic in our own country, we may, with equal confidence, anticipate a greater increase in the value of this property, not only from the establishment of peace and good government throughout Europe, but from the vast addition which must speedily be made to the Railway system of the Continent. The population of Spain, of Italy, of Greece, and of vast regions in Europe, who adhere like barnacles to their native rocks, must yet be roused by the shriek of the steam-whistle. When steam navigation is extended, the

swarms of Asia, and the millions of America, will send forth their contingents to see the wonders of mechanism in Britain,—to learn the lessons of civilisation which she teaches, and to imbibe the great political, and moral, and religious truths which irradiate our happy land,—the great sea-light which now shines in bright effulgence amid the moral darkness and the social desolation of Europe.

Nor is it a groundless expectation to anticipate an amelioration of existing railway property from a consolidation, as we may call it, of portions of existing lines, as well as from mechanical improvements in the machinery employed. Owing to the rivalry of different companies, a number of lines, or portions of lines, stand in direct commercial antagonism to one another. In some cases the parties have shaken hands, and work the rival lines for their mutual benefit. Now, in these cases, where a line, or a portion of a line, contributes either very little, or not at all, to the development of local traffic, that line, or portion of a line, should be abandoned, and the traffic, previously carried along the two lines, transferred to one.

There is another and a less problematical way of improving railway property, namely, by the introduction of a rigid economy into its management. This must be done without diminishing the security of property and the safety of passengers, and must be the result of study and experience,—of knowledge invited and collected, and of modes of management gathered from the practice of American and foreign railways. The public travel too fast for the fares which they pay. If they are in a hurry they ought to pay for the quickness of their transit, and if the express trains are continued their fares should be increased.*

In making changes like these, and introducing an uniform and economical management into the British railway system, the chairman and directors of individual companies must abandon that system of rivalry and mutual antagonism by which such an enormous expenditure has been incurred, and combine their knowledge and their influence in advancing the general interests of the Iron Republic, in which all individual interests are necessarily comprehended. An uniform system of fares will then be adopted—an uniform and universal mode of working the lines will be established—an uniform method of keeping and exhibiting the accounts will prevail, and the superintendence of independent auditors will give a new character to railway transactions and a new security to railway property.

2. But we are surely entitled to regard the Railway system in

* It is asserted, and doubtless truly, that if the London and North-Western were to take off their express trains they would save at once £20,000 a-year, "besides severe extra damage to their rails."—*Stokers and Pokers*, p. 133.

this country as still in its infancy, and not likely to be limited to the 9565 miles which the Railway Commissioners regard as probable "under existing Acts," or even to the 5007+7005, or 12,012 miles, which would be the limit of the system if all the authorized lines were executed. The country cannot go backwards in its present course. The public must obtain means for the quick transit of their persons and properties, and if it is necessary to pay higher for it they will cheerfully do it. The man of business and the man of pleasure will never consent to surrender such a luxury. It would be to shorten the very term of their existence, to die before their time, and to die, too, by their own hands. These liberal contributors to the railway treasury will, on the contrary, make new sacrifices to increase the privileges they possess—to extend the sphere of their speculations, and multiply the sources of their enjoyment. The social mass, too, who have been doomed by poverty and toil to occupy, almost without a change of air, the town or the parish in which they first drew their breath—who have scarcely ever seen any horizon but one, will certainly never renounce the rights of cheap locomotion which the Legislature has so liberally secured to them; and, we are persuaded, that they would pay much more than they do to secure its permanent enjoyment. We feel confident, therefore, that the Railway system in this country will advance steadily, if not quickly, with increasing dividends to the shareholders, and increased comfort and security to the public, till every valley has its single line, of wood if not of iron, and every village or parish a cheap vehicle to carry its population to the nearest station.

With these views, founded on our past experience of the progress of canals and steam navigation, we confidently expect that railway profits and railway extension will, at no distant day, be realized by the unaided enterprise of British capital; but we trust that Government will feel it their duty to expedite this desirable event, and to grant pecuniary aid to complete the system of intercommunication so happily commenced. They have most wisely extended their liberality to Ireland; and if Scotland were to raise its uncomplaining voice, as it ought, Government might either execute, (or aid in its execution,) a great trunk line from Perth to Inverness and from Inverness to Thurso, thus developing the traffic of the country, and uniting the railway communications along its eastern shores with the bays and islands of the west, by the steam navigation of Lochness and the Caledonian Canal. The privileges which the Legislature has demanded for the State in reference to the carrying of the mail and the transport of troops and stores, give the railway companies a peculiar claim to that kind of liberality which in benefiting them would benefit the nation, by extended privileges of transport over the

whole country. This step must be taken in Ireland, and Scotland may well lay claim to a similar boon.

Early in 1839, when the railway mania had no existence, and when railways were scarcely known in Scotland, the writer of this Article, in urging the Government to complete the Caledonian Canal, which was vehemently opposed by a powerful party in England, did not scruple, in the following passage, to predict what is now nearly accomplished—the great extension of the Railway system to this part of the island. That it will be completed by the lines we have mentioned, we cannot doubt, unless the country is under the dominion of a Government incapable of understanding the best interests of the empire:—"Another object not less important, though perhaps more remote in its accomplishment, is the union of the great lines of railway communication which are rapidly extending themselves to Edinburgh on the East, and to Glasgow on the West Coast of Scotland. Glasgow will, no doubt, be the terminus of the Great Western line, but there is every reason to believe that the Eastern line will extend itself to a much higher latitude. When low-water piers at Newhaven, (Granton,) and Burntisland, shall be erected, a railway through Fife will be the next step in the progress of improvement; and in the county of Forfar nearly sixty miles of railway are already completed, one of the lines stretching along the coast from Dundee to Arbroath. That these works will speedily reach Montrose will scarcely be doubted; and though the Eastern Coast to the north of this port presents some embarrassing acclivities, yet we scruple not to predict that a quarter of a century will scarcely elapse before the Great Eastern line shall reach Inverness, the capital of the Highlands. When this grand object is gained, the value of the Caledonian Canal will then be recognised by the blindest and dullest of its detractors. It will stand forth the connecting link between the great lines of traffic which embroider the skirts of our otherwise deserted shores—the grand and vital trunk into which the arteries of the South will pour their exuberant wealth. The remotest Highlands will then become a suburb of the imperial metropolis. The fruits of the South will be gathered in climates where they could not grow; and, while the luxuries of the East are sweetening the coarse fare of the mountaineers, the more intellectual imports of civilisation and knowledge will gradually dispel the ignorance and feudal barbarism which still linger among their fastnesses."

3. There is another view of the railway future to which we look forward with anxiety if not with hope. However desirable it may be to put an end to that rivalry and competition which have been so fatal to railway interests, and however ready the offend-

ing parties are to acknowledge this truth, it is a difficult problem to remedy the evil while opposite interests really exist, and while these interests are under the control of numerous local boards. The only plan which is likely to be effective for this and other purposes, is to place the railway property of the empire under the management of Government. The nation would of course become the purchasers, and an ample and liberal compensation would be given to the shareholders. This step ought to have been taken after the success of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway had established, beyond a doubt, the practicability and advantages of railways. Year after year a few far-seeing men pointed out to the Government of the day the advantages of such a measure; but divided Cabinets, and parties struggling for power, refused to listen to the voice of wisdom "crying in the streets." They wanted the practical knowledge that was necessary to understand the question of duty and policy which wise men had solved; and even if the Railway Schoolmaster had been abroad, the Government lacked moral courage to avail itself of the crisis, and the Cabinet a master-mind to assume the responsibility. Even after speculation had run wild, and the walls of Parliament were ringing with the cries of infuriated gamblers, struggling for legislative authority to compass each other's ruin, the Cabinet looked on with sullen indifference, contenting themselves with wresting from the desperate adventurers, temporarily in their power, some privilege or boon for which they should have liberally paid. Nay, when official Returns had exhibited the deplorable truth, that in 1845, 1846, and 1847, UPWARDS OF TEN MILLIONS* of the money of impoverished shareholders had been squandered in Parliamentary contests, where the victors suffered more than the vanquished, the Government remained deaf to the calls of practical wisdom, and blind to the true and most obvious interests of the country. It has indeed been wickedly surmised that the State is lying in wait to buy up the railway property of the kingdom when they have helped, by oppressive taxation, or by an unjust interference with its management, to paralyze its energy and reduce its dividends; but this very charge presupposes a degree of sagacity which they have never yet evinced, united with a degree of injustice of which they are incapable. If the smallest sphere, moulded from the ashes of Lord George Bentinck, could be administered homœopathically to the Premier, and transferred by mesmerism to his Cabinet, the pulse of the Government might yet beat in synchronism with the wishes and wants of the nation.

* "This money," says a distinguished author, "would, at the rate of £20,000 per mile, have constructed a National Railway 500 miles in length—say from London to Aberdeen!"—*Stokers and Pokers*, p. 17.

We feel it to be almost a puerile task to substantiate these views, either by illustration or argument. It has long been the practice of British Rulers to entrust to private enterprise important interests, which, in all other countries, are under the control of the State. Science, whether transcendental or practical, is here doomed to work at its own expense for the benefit of the public ; and inventions, which would add to the glory and to the resources of the empire, are crushed by the very hand that is held out to protect them. It is under the same malign influence that railway enterprise has been first encouraged and then oppressed. The great seal of England may be said to have been suspended to its patent, while an English Court of Law was sanctioning its evasion. If it has been the practice of foreign States, and if it has proved to be their interest, to construct railways at the nation's expense, what reason can be alleged that the same policy would be injurious in England ? It is never too late to retrace steps that have been false. It is a proof of superior wisdom to acknowledge past error, and to shun it in the future. If upwards of ONE HUNDRED MILLIONS of the gains of skilful labour and of honest industry have been sunk in fruitless railway expenditure through the rashness of its owners and the supineness of the Legislature, it is the imperative duty of the Government to take into its own hands and complete an enterprise thus rashly begun, thus recklessly pursued, and thus ruinously brought to a close.

Having thus attempted to give our readers some account of the History and Statistics of Railway Enterprise, and of the present and future prospects of Railway Proprietors, we shall now proceed to make them acquainted with the nature and construction of a railway, considered as a grand mechanical invention ; with the public works and machinery which it requires, and with the improvements which are yet necessary to prevent those dangerous collisions which were so frequent in its early history.

A railway is, properly speaking, and in its original and most simple form, a pair of rails or lines made of stone, wood, or iron, lying as level as possible, for the purpose of allowing carriages to convey goods or passengers along it without being retarded by friction. We have seen narrow paths of granite which perform the functions of a railroad ; and wooden rails were very common in America when the invention was first introduced. The rails of railways, however, are now almost universally made of cast-iron, and rest upon what are called wooden sleepers, lying across the line, or sometimes upon long beams of wood, which support the rails in every part of their length. The *gaug*e of a railway is the distance between the two rails, or between the rims of the opposite wheels which rest upon it. It is called the *narrow gaug*e when the distance of the rails from centre to centre is from 4½ to

5½ feet; and the *broad gauge*, when they are 7 feet 2 inches wide, as in the Great Western.* A railway may be made with only a *single line*, or *one pair of rails*; and many such have been executed. In this case, as in canals, there must be passing places, where one of two trains going in opposite directions may pass the other. On all railways, however, where there is much traffic there are *two lines*. The building at each end of the line for the accommodation of passengers and the reception of goods is called the *terminus*; and at the distance of every 5 or 6 miles there are station-houses, where passengers and goods may be received when the trains stop.

With all the aid that can be derived from deep cuttings and embankments, the engineer can seldom obtain a line as level as he could desire. When the railway, as it often necessarily does, runs from estuary to estuary, or from sea to sea, it must rise over high elevations or mountain ridges, availing itself of gorges or passes in the mountains, so as to have its highest point or summit level as low as possible. In such cases the engineer divides his line into different portions called *gradients*. One gradient may be so inclined to the horizon as to rise *one foot in a hundred*, which is very steep, another, one foot in five hundred, another, one foot in a thousand, while some are nearly level. In the Edinburgh and Glasgow line, for example, there are *ten* gradients, varying from 1 in 880 to 1 in 5426, there being a perfect level at the summit of nearly seven miles, and one gradient of nearly eleven miles rising 1 in 1159. When the gradient is very steep, of which we have examples both at Edinburgh and Glasgow, the train is dragged up by a fixed engine by means of iron ropes or chains, and it descends by gravity re-

* In almost all the railways previous to the Great Western, the breadth of gauge was 4 feet 8½ inches. In several of the Scottish lines the gauge is 5 feet 6 inches. The virtual combination of the two gauges on the same railway, for example, on the Oxford and Rugby line, as proposed by Mr. Brunel, is to be effected by "the introduction of a single additional rail to each line of rails, or separate railway, the outer rail of each railway being common to the two gauges." This arrangement "admits of the running of all the trains of both gauges into the same sidings, and up to the same passenger platforms." Captain Simmons, after a mature consideration of this plan, reports favourably upon it, and concludes with these words:—"By avoiding all meeting points, by a separation of the gauges in the sidings and stations, and by most stringent regulations preventing, under any circumstances, the connecting, in one train, of carriages of different gauges, I think the safety of the public will be guaranteed with ordinary care and supervision, and that the line may, by a strict compliance with these conditions, be rendered practically safe." Captain Simmons here admits that the combination of the gauges is *theoretically unsafe*. The elements of danger are already too numerous in the best formed and best managed railways to render advisable any changes of a doubtful character, and not loudly demanded either by the interests of shareholders, or for the accommodation of the public. The cautious and hesitating language used by Captain Simmons will, we trust, prevent that complication of lines which the proposed combination must produce.

gulated by brakes. At Glasgow this gradient, one mile and 15 chains long, is inclined 1 in 43, and at Edinburgh 1 in 27.

When a railway is executed between two towns, the line would be the best possible if it could, as in some highly favoured localities, be perfectly straight and level; but in general this is impossible. If the country should be level, which is seldom the case, the interposition of gentlemen's country-houses and grounds prevents the line of the railway from being straight; and though, in some cases, a certain degree of encroachment is permitted upon this kind of property, the railway proprietors must pay dearly for the privilege. When the surface of the country is undulating, the engineer, keeping as much as he can to a straight line, guides it in such a manner that the cuttings of earth from the elevation may as nearly as possible fill up the adjacent hollows; and when the elevation is lofty, he is obliged to cut a tunnel through the soil or the rock, of which it consists. If there is a hollow occupied by a moss or a morass, he must bring earth from the nearest elevation to form an embankment, along which the rails may be laid. When the line of railway passes over well frequented roads, or over rivers, a bridge must be built, along which the rails are laid; and when a broad valley, either with or without a stream, has to be crossed, a *viaduct* is constructed for the purpose. When a road is not much frequented, the railway passes over it, and it is closed with gates when trains are about to pass, and again opened for the passage of carriages, the gate on each side closing the ends of the railway. This is called a *level crossing*, a contrivance which the public often successfully opposes on account of the obstruction it presents to carriages, and the danger to travellers. The cheapness of it, however, recommends it to the railway company, and many thousand pounds have often been spent in obtaining a decision favourable to one of the contending parties.

The magnificent structures which the railway system has called into existence exhibit, in a striking degree, the wealth and enterprise of the nation, and some of them may even be ranked among the wonders of the world. The splendid edifices which form the termini of railways at populous cities particularly, with the iron roofs which unite them, and protect the trains and the passengers from the weather;—and the refreshment stations, such as those at Wolverton on the London and Birmingham, and Swindon on the Great Western, are too well known to passengers to require any description.* The traveller who enjoys the luxuries they supply has generally time enough to admire and even to

* The Euston Station in London cost £81,582. The great Dépôt at Camden covering 27 acres, cost £114,885, and the Locomotive Engine Dépôt at Wolverton, £109,454.

examine them; while he passes through tunnels and over bridges and viaducts, without knowing, except in the case of tunnels, that he is travelling over them. We shall, therefore, describe some of the more remarkable of these public works, in the conception and construction of which the genius and the talent of the engineer have been signally displayed.

Some of the most interesting of these works are the tunnels, which it is necessary often to cut through hills or elevations of clay, gravel, or rock. At an early period in railway history the public took alarm at the idea of being carried through long tunnels excluded from the light of heaven, and breathing an atmosphere unventilated and polluted with subterraneous effluvia, and the artificial combinations of smoke and steam. In February 1837, a committee of physicians, surgeons, and chemists, inspected the tunnel at Primrose hill, then in progress, 3750 feet long, 22 feet high, and 23½ feet wide, with five shafts, about seven feet in diameter, for ventilation: They reported that the apprehension which had been expressed that tunnels would be detrimental to the health, or inconvenient to the feelings of passengers, “were perfectly futile and groundless,” and experience has fully confirmed this decision. The tunnel near Kilsby, on the London and Birmingham railway, though 7270 feet long, is “traversed without the slightest inconvenience or sensation of cold or damp, the change experienced being merely that from sunshine to shade, and from daylight to lamplight.”

This tunnel is one of the most remarkable, not merely for its size, but from the singular difficulties which were encountered in its construction. Its depth beneath the surface required to be about 160 feet, and it was to have two shafts or openings to the sky 60 feet in diameter, not merely to ventilate it, but to give sufficient light to allow the rails to be seen along its whole length. The strata beneath were found, by numerous borings, to be the shale of the lower oolite, and the work was contracted for for the sum of £99,000. Owing to its great length, it was necessary to have eighteen working shafts or openings to the surface, through which the earth or rock from the tunnel was to be removed. During the progress of the work it was discovered, to the astonishment both of the engineer and the contractor, that a quicksand beneath a bed of clay penetrated 1200 feet into the tunnel. Appalled by this apparently unsurmountable obstruction, the contractor took to his bed, and though relieved from his engagement by the company, he languished and died. The water rushed into the shafts to such an extent that the work was on the eve of being abandoned, when Mr. Robert Stephenson, relying on the power of science to overcome any physical difficulty, succeeded, in the course of eight months, in carrying off the

water at the rate of 1800 gallons per minute, by the aid of thirteen steam engines, 200 horses, and 1250 men. Two years and a half were required to complete this stupendous work. The number of bricks employed in lining the top and the bottom of the tunnel, was 36,000,000, which, it has been calculated, would nearly make a footpath a yard wide from London to Aberdeen.*

The following is a list of a few of the principal tunnels on English lines :—

	Length in Yards.	Height in Feet.	Width in Feet.
The Box tunnel,†	3123	27	25
Manchester and Leeds tunnel,	2860	21½	24
Kilsby tunnel,	2423	27	23½
Liverpool and Manchester tunnel, from Wapping to Edgehill,	2216	16	22
Abbots' Cliff tunnel, Dover,	2206	25	24
Lime Street,	2000	19	25
Watford, on the London and Birmingham, 1830			
Leicester and Swannington,	1760	13½	10½
Shakespeare tunnels, Dover, double,	1430	30	24
Primrose Hill,	1250	25	22
Edinburgh and Granton,	1001	17	24
Bangor tunnel,	924		
Canterbury and Whitstable,	880	12	12
Callander, Edinburgh and Glasgow,	830	22	26
Leeds and Selby,	700	17	22
Penmaenbach, Chester and Holyhead,	632	24	

In some instances, such as in that of the Penmaenbach tunnel, 47½ miles from Chester, there is no occasion for any masonry lining. The tunnel is here driven through basaltic rock, which entirely supports itself. It has a semicircular top, with upright sides, and was worked from adits to the beach. It is curved throughout its whole length with a radius of 40 chains. The Penmaenmawr tunnel, 3½ miles from Chester, though driven through 250 yards of greenstone, required to be lined throughout with rubble greenstone masonry; and the Bangor tunnel, though at first considered solid enough to support itself from the hardness of the stone through which it was cut, yet having shown symptoms of not being able to withstand the action of the weather, Mr. Stephenson has ordered it to be lined with brick.

When the railway has to pass at a depth less than 60 feet beneath the surface, the engineer prefers *cutting* through the hill or ridge to tunnelling, unless when the earth obtained from the cut-

* On the Great Western between Bath and Chippenham; the quantity of excavation is 247,000 cubic yards of freestone chiefly, with some marl.

† The expense of this tunnel was upwards of £300,000, or £125 per yard. The cost of tunnelling varies from £20 to £160 per yard. The great Thames tunnel cost about £1200 per yard!

ting is required for an embankment, in which case he would cut when the depth is above 60 feet, though in ordinary cases he would have tunnelled. Cuttings through clay or gravel or loose materials, are nearly as expensive as through rock, because in the latter case, much less cutting is requisite. The cuttings and embankments, or *earthworks* as they are called, on the London and Birmingham, were of the most extraordinary kind. "There is scarcely," says Mr. Whishaw, "a portion of this line from one end to the other, which is not either covered by embankments above the general surface of the country, or sunk below it by means of excavation." By the original section, the excavations amounted to 12,081,116, and the embankments to 10,698,315 cubic yards. At the Tring cutting alone, 1,297,763 cubic yards of chalk were excavated. The following abstract of the calculations of Mr. Lecount, respecting the whole work done on the portion of a railway, is given by Sir Francis Head, in his work already referred to:—

"The great Pyramid of Egypt was, according to Diodorus Siculus, constructed by three hundred thousand—according to Herodotus, by one hundred thousand men; it required for its execution 20 years, and the labour expended on it has been estimated as equivalent to lifting 15,733,000,000 (fifteen thousand seven hundred and thirty-three millions) of cubic feet of stone, one foot high. Now, if in the same measure the labour expended in constructing the *Southern* division only of the present London and North-Western Railway, be reduced to one common denomination, the result is 25,000,000,000 (twenty-five thousand millions) of cubic feet of similar material lifted to the same height, being 9,267,000,000 (nine thousand two hundred and sixty-seven millions) of cubic feet *more* than was lifted for the pyramid, and yet the English work was performed by about 20,000 men only, in less than 5 years.

"Again, it has been calculated by Mr. Lecount, that the quantity of earth moved in the single division (112 miles in length) of the railway in question, would be sufficient to make a footpath a foot high and a yard broad, round the whole circumference of the earth! The cost of this division of the railway in penny-pieces, being sufficient to form a copper kerb or edge to it. Supposing, therefore, the same proportionate quantity of earth to be moved in the 7150 miles of railway sanctioned by Parliament at the commencement of 1848, our engineers, within about 15 years, would, in the construction of our railways alone, have removed earth sufficient to girdle the globe with a road one foot high and one hundred and ninety-one feet broad!"—P. 28.

When earth cannot be obtained for embankments, and when good stone can be readily obtained, a *viaduct* is cheaper and better. In America, and sometimes in this country, viaducts have been made of wood. On the Edinburgh and Glasgow line, we have two very magnificent stone viaducts, one over the Almond,

and the other over the Avon. The Almond viaduct is 2160 feet long, its width 28 feet, and its height 50. It consists of *thirty-six* arches, each of 75 feet span, and as seen from Newliston and other points of view, is a most beautiful and magnificent object. The Stockport viaduct, which carries the Manchester and Birmingham railway over the River Mersey at Stockport, designed by George Watson Buck, is one of the most imposing structures in the kingdom. Its whole length is 2179 feet, running at a height of 106 feet above the surface of the river, and consists of 22 semicircular arches, each of which has a span of 63 feet. The average height of the piers is 40 feet. The whole of the London and Greenwich railway may be said to be one viaduct, consisting of *eight hundred and seventy-eight* arches, of 18 feet span! It is 26 feet wide, and 20 high.

One of the finest viaducts in the kingdom is that on the Shrewsbury and Chester Canal, crossing the river Dee, and adding new beauty to the picturesque valley of Llangollen. This valley had previously attained distinction in the history of engineering from the magnificent aqueduct of Pontcysyllte, which was designed by Mr. Telford, and completed in 1805, at the expense of £47,018. The object of this noble structure was to carry the Ellesmere Canal across the valley of the Dee, at the height of 127 feet above the river. After the embankments had been executed, 1007 feet remained to be crossed, and this was effected by twenty piers of solid masonry, rising to the height of 75 feet, and united by nineteen arches of 45 feet span. The present viaduct is a still more magnificent structure. It is 1532 feet long. It consists of nineteen semicircular arches of 60 feet span, and the height from the bed of the river to the top of the parapet at the centre piece, is 148 feet. It is founded on the solid rock. The piers, which are 13 feet thick and 28½ feet long at the springing of the arch, are built of a beautiful stone. The first stone of this viaduct, designed by Mr. Henry Robertson, was laid on the 19th April 1846, and the last arch was closed on the 12th August 1848. This viaduct is said to be the largest in the world, and cost upwards of £100,000. It contains above 64,000 cubic yards of masonry, and the cost of the timber for the scaffolding was £15,000.

Besides tunnels, &c., works of a very different kind have been found necessary for preventing obstruction in the line, and danger to the passengers. At the east end, for example, of the Penmaenmawr tunnel, a *Gallery of timber* covering the railway for 390 feet of its length, was found necessary to protect the line from stones which occasionally descend from the hill above, which is covered with loose rocks and exceedingly steep, rising to the height of 1400 feet. The timber employed in the covering is *fourteen inches* thick, and is placed at an angle of 30°,

resting on one side upon a stone wall washed by the sea, and on the other upon the hill, at an elevation of 40 feet above the level of the rails, having an intermediate timber support and timber struts, at every six feet apart.*

In passing across the ordinary rivers of England, bridges of very considerable magnitude have been rendered necessary, not so much from the breadth of the river, as from the great height of its banks, which compels the engineer to carry the railway at a great elevation above the stream. Two very magnificent bridges of this kind are now in the act of construction over the Tweed at Berwick, and the Tyne at Newcastle. Works still more expensive and magnificent become necessary when railways have to cross arms of the sea, as in the Chester and Holyhead Railway, where the line passes over the Conway river or arm of the sea, and the Menai Straits.

The necessity of facilitating the communication between London and Dublin, had long ago induced the Government to expend large sums of money upon the roads and harbours which intervened; and in 1818, Parliament granted the sum of £20,000 to erect a bridge over the Menai Straits, which was the most embarrassing obstacle in the whole line of communication. Mr. Telford recommended a structure of wrought iron on the suspension principle, which, after a careful investigation of its merits, was adopted. The foundation-stone was laid on the 10th August 1819. In 1821, about 350 men and six vessels were employed upon it: It was completed early in 1826, and on the morning of Monday, the 30th of January, the London mail coach passed across the estuary at the height of 100 feet above the tideway. The total length of this noble bridge is about *one-third* of a mile, or 1710 feet. The total weight of the iron work is 4,373,282 lbs., or upwards of 2186 tons, and a single coat of the paint which defends it from the weather, weighed 2½ tons. The cost of the bridge with the toll-houses, &c., was £120,000.†

A great improvement in the communication between London and Dublin having been effected by the railroad from Chester to Holyhead, it became necessary to erect bridges at Conway and Bangor for carrying it across the two arms of the sea. The genius of Mr. Robert Stephenson, which had been so often displayed in railway enterprise, was summoned to a task of no ordinary difficulty, when he was called upon to give plans for these two public works. He proposed to erect what had never before

* Report of the Railway Commissioners for 1848. Part ii. p. 33.

† The Right of Ferry was purchased from Lady Erskine of Cambo, for £26,954, or thirty years' purchase, so that the whole cost of the bridge was £146,954. The passage across the strait being now effected by a railway, the utility of the bridge, as well as the amount of tolls collected, must be greatly reduced.

been thought of, and still less attempted, a *tubular bridge* over both the arms of the sea which it was necessary to pass.

The Conway tubular bridge, which is now completed, and daily used for the passage of trains, consists of a horizontal square tube of wrought iron, resting on piers of solid masonry, 400 feet distant from each other. The whole length of the tube is 424 feet, its extreme depth 25 feet 6 inches in the centre, 22 feet 6 inches at the ends, and so formed as to leave a clear space within, 21 feet 8 inches in height at the centre, 18 feet 8 inches high at the ends, and 14 feet 3 inches wide. This tube, as it is rather improperly called, is in reality a rectangular tunnel, or hollow square iron box, with top, bottom, and sides, but open at the ends, through which the trains pass upon ordinary rails laid on the bottom. All round the open part for the admission of the trains, there is a great deal of wrought-iron carpentry, or framing, for the purpose of giving strength to the whole structure, the work on the top, at the bottom, and on the sides, having each a separate function to perform; and it is in this part of his work that the science of Mr. Stephenson is pre-eminently evinced. The object of the iron work *above* the top, consisting of eight square cells or tubes, is to resist compression; that of the work *below* the bottom, consisting of six square cells, to resist tension; and that at the *sides*, to secure the combined action of the top and bottom; the arrangement and rivetting of the rolled iron plates, and of the angle iron, being varied to fulfil these different conditions. The Conway end of the tube is immovable, being fixed on the pier, and made to rest on two beds of creosoted timber, with intermediate cast-iron bed-plates; but the Chester end is left *perfectly free*, so that when it expands by heat, or contracts by cold, which it is constantly doing, it meets with no obstruction, the tube resting on cast-iron rollers, between bed-plates of the same metal, with layers of creosoted timber three inches thick. The rollers are six inches in diameter, and have sufficient play to allow 12 inches of motion. The total weight of the wrought iron is 1140 tons, and, including the castings of six feet at each end to give bearing on the abutments, the total weight is 1300 tons. "The tube," says Captain Simmons, "as may be easily conceived, is a delicate thermometer, from its great length, and from the nature of the material, which is so peculiarly sensitive to temperature, expanding .0001 of its length, or *half an inch* in this case for each increase of 15° of temperature of Fahrenheit, and contracting in the same ratio." Captain Simmons made a number of interesting experiments, in order to test the safety of this bridge under the various kinds of action to which it may be exposed, and the effects likely to be produced upon it by the slow influence of time, and the elements.

Having placed on the tube a weight of 86 tons (a weight probably as great as will come upon it) upon 110 feet of the tube, as he found that the deflection was 1.02 inch. With 135 tons, covering 185 feet in the centre, the deflection was 1.08 inch; and with 245, the deflection was $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch, the tube remaining 0.18 inch, or a little more than $\frac{1}{6}$ th of an inch, below its original level.

A heavily loaded train of 250 tons, drawn by two engines, at the rate of 15 miles an hour, produced a deflection of only 1.08 inch, and scarcely any perceptible vibration. Two locomotives, weighing together about 50 tons, when passed through the tube with a velocity of between 20 and 25 miles an hour, occasioned a deflection of 0.6, or little more than half an inch, and a vibration almost imperceptible. Captain Simmons has assigned satisfactory reasons why no evil is to be apprehended from time, by loosening the rivets, or changing the texture of the material. Nor does he apprehend any injurious effects from the oxidation of the iron from steam or damp air, or the vapour of sea-water, or from the continued action of high winds.

Towards the end of 1848, a second tube was erected on the Conway bridge for the purpose of carrying the down line of the Chester and Holyhead Railway. In examining the amount of deflection under different loads, Captain Simmons obtained the following results with this second tube:—

	WEIGHT.			
	52 tons over 62 feet.	112 tons over 133 feet.	173 tons over 211 feet.	235 tons over 298 feet.
6 feet west of centre,	0.48 in.	0.98 in.	1.30 in.	1.47 in.
6 feet east of centre,	0.48	0.98	1.27	1.47

Two locomotives, as in the former case, or with velocities up to 25 miles an hour, produced deflections proportional to their weight, and very little vibration. The two tubes were floated from their birthplace, and raised by hydraulic presses to their bed upon the piers.

The Britannia Tubular Bridge over the Menai Straits is a work still more magnificent. This bridge takes its name from the Britannia rock, which stands in the middle of the Straits. The Britannia pier, founded upon this rock, is equally distant from the Anglesey and Caernarvon piers, being 460 feet in the clear from each. The object of these *three* piers is to sustain the four ends of the four long tubes, which are to span the distance from shore to shore. From the Anglesey and Caernarvon piers other four tubes pass to the abutments on the shore. The pile of masonry on the Anglesey side is 163 feet 6 inches high, and 173 feet in length from the front to the end of the wing walls. These wing walls terminate in fine pedestals, upon which are

placed two colossal lions. The Anglesey pier is about 196 feet high, the bottom of the tubes being 124 feet above low-water. It is 55 feet wide and 32 long. The Britannia pier is about 240 feet high; and the Caernarvon one is of the same height and dimensions as the Anglesey pier; and the Caernarvon abutment is of the same size as the one on the Anglesey shore, its wing walls terminating in pedestals for another pair of colossal lions. The two pair of long tubes, each 470 feet long, have been built on platforms, along the Caernarvon shore; and the two short ones on scaffoldings, at the proper height and in the exact position which they are required to occupy when completed. The tubes are constructed in the same manner as those at Conway, the only difference being, that they are 58 feet longer and 3 feet higher. The four colossal lions which ornament the pedestals at each end of the bridge were modelled by Mr. J. Thomas. They are of Egyptian character, and have been executed with admirable taste and skill. They are each $25\frac{1}{2}$ feet long, $12\frac{1}{2}$ feet high, and 8 feet wide, and weigh about 80 tons. No less than *two thousand* cubic feet of stone were required for each lion.*

The total length of the bridge from lion to lion is, .	1835 feet.
The greatest height of the bridge above low-water mark, 240 ..	
Height of bottom of tube or rails above high-water, 104 ..	
Quantity of masonry in the piers and abutments and wing walls, .	1,400,000 cub. ft.
The timber used in the various scaffoldings, .	450,000 ..
The weight of malleable iron in the tubes, .	10,000 tons.
Weight of cast iron, .	1,400 ..
Weight of one of the largest tubes, .	1,800 ..
Value of one of these tubes, .	£54,000
Cost of the scaffolding, .	£50,000

When a railway is thus completed by cuttings, embankments, tunnels, bridges, and viaducts, so as to form a road of iron as nearly straight and horizontal as circumstances will permit, it becomes a matter of some consideration to determine the power by which it shall be worked, and the manner in which that power is to be applied. Horses, which were the power first adopted, have now been abandoned; but it is not improbable that they may again be put in requisition, when, in the further development of the railway system, single lines of wood or of iron may be erected at a moderate expense as tributaries to the great lines, or for the purpose of connecting farming and manufacturing establishments with existing railways. May not a cheap railway of a *single rail* be constructed and wrought with horses? The loaded waggons

* See *Timbs' Year-Book of Facts for 1849*, pp. 5, 6, where there is given a drawing of the bridge by Mr. Stephenson.

placed between two horses, and resting on one or more wheels in the direction of the line, might be strapped to the horses so as to prevent them falling to one side ; or the same effect might be produced with one horse or more placed in the direction of the line, by a contrivance to keep the load in a vertical position, in which case, a very narrow path, not wider than the towing-path of a canal,* would be sufficient. The power of steam was of course immediately adopted, as we have seen when the first great line of railway was completed ; but it became a question whether a fixed engine or a locomotive would be the most effectual one. The Blackwall Railway is, we believe, the only one upon which fixed engines are employed, but their adoption is owing to the character of the line, and not to any idea of fixed engines being superior to locomotive ones.

Attempts have been successfully made to apply the pressure of the atmosphere as the moving power on railways. This ingenious and beautiful thought we owe to Mr. Samuda, who actually had it carried into effect on the Railway from Dalkey to Kingston, where it has been successfully used without any accident, since the 31st October 1843. It was used, too, for a very long time, and afterwards abandoned, on the London and Croydon Railway. The atmospheric principle is still in use on the South Devon Railway, but a new portion of this line from Totness to Laira, a distance of twenty-one miles, though intended to be worked like the rest of the line, is to be worked by locomotives. A wide tube of iron was laid between the lines of rails, which had an elastic valve or slit in it throughout the whole length of the line. A piston moved in this tube, the handle or arm of which was vertical, and connected with a carriage. When the piston moved in the tube, this arm opened the valve or slit, which closed behind it—the slit being always kept closed and air-tight by grease or fusible metal, or some suitable composition. Large fixed engines were employed to pump out the air from the tube, and when a vacuum was nearly produced, the pressure of the external air behind the piston pushed it on, carrying forward the carriage to which it was attached, followed by the train. This species of railway had many advantages. The conducting carriage could not be carried off the rails, in consequence of its being connected with the tube ; and there was no danger from fire or explosion of boilers. The expense, however, of the fixed engines which were necessary to exhaust the tube was very great, and the atmospheric principle has been abandoned on the Croydon line. Proposals have been made to construct atmospheric railways on other principles, and Mr. W. P. Struve has lately pro-

* The late Lord Napier actually constructed and used a carriage with one wheel for the purpose of being driven along a footpath.

posed to carry the train through a covered viaduct nine feet square. The piston was to be a shield fixed on wheels, and made to fit the covered way, but allowing a sufficient space beyond its outer edge so that it may not touch the inner surface of the viaduct. The only result of this idea has been a working model, which was exhibited to the British Association.

The locomotive steam-engine having been found the cheapest and most effective method of applying the force of steam,—a living agent in short which we can send where and when we please, it may now be said to be the power which is universally used on railways. Some of the early locomotive engines moved upon only four wheels, but they are now generally made with *six* wheels, the two middle wheels being called the *driving* wheels, as the power of the engine is directly applied to them, and the other *four* the carrying wheels. The driving wheels vary from three and a half to eight or even ten feet, and the carrying wheels from three and a half to six feet. The *Hurricane*, constructed by R. and W. Hawthorn for the Great-Western, had its driving wheels ten feet high, and its carrying wheels four and a half feet; its weight, when in working trim, being eleven tons, ten cwt. Ordinary locomotives are from eighteen to twenty feet long, fourteen feet high to the top of the chimney, and twelve to the top of the dome, their width depending on the gauge of the railway. Along with the locomotive, and behind it, is the *tender*, a vehicle on four wheels, about fourteen or fifteen feet long, and six high, which carries water in a tank at its front, and a supply of coke behind.* After the locomotive has received from the water crane a thousand gallons of cold water, and from the coke slier one ton of fuel, it advances to the front of the train ready for its work. The train, consisting of many first, second, and third class carriages, luggage vans, horse boxes, carriage trucks, and perhaps a travelling post-office, all united by chains, and prevented from striking against each other by what are called *buffers*,† is then dragged along with a velocity varying from twenty to sixty miles an hour. On the 13th November 1839, the *Camilla*, and on the 16th November the *Sunbeam*, went on one part of their journey on the Grand Junction Railway at the rate of $68\frac{1}{2}$ miles! The greatest railway speed, however, that has yet been accomplished was displayed by the *Courier* in travelling from Didcot to Paddington, on the 26th August 1848, with the twelve o'clock express train from Exeter. This engine is one of the eight wheel class, with eight feet driving wheels, a cylinder of

* A locomotive with a cylinder fifteen inches in diameter, costs £1950; sixteen inches, £2118; and eighteen inches, £2500, the tenders costing £500 each.

† The *buffers* are leather cushions stuffed with horse hair, which strike one another, and break the shock when one carriage is pushed against another.

eighteen inches, and a stroke of twenty-four feet. From a state of rest at Didcot to the time when the train entered the station at Paddington; only 49' 13" elapsed; that is, at the average rate of *sixty-seven miles* an hour, including the time lost in getting up speed when leaving Didcot, and in reducing speed when approaching Paddington. Exclusive, however, of these losses, exactly in travelling from the forty-seventh mile-post, which the train passed at 3^h 46' 40½" to the fourth mile-post, which it reached at 4^h 23' 26½", *forty-three miles were performed in thirty-six minutes and forty seconds*, or an average speed accomplished of *upwards of seventy miles per hour*. While the train is thus almost on the wing, beating the eagle in its flight, the passengers are reclining in their easy chairs, thinking or sleeping, reading or writing, as if they were in their own happy homes—safer, indeed, than there, for thieves cannot rob them by day, nor burglars alarm them by night. The steam horse starts neither at the roar of the thunderstorm, nor the flash of its fire: Draughts of a purer air expel the marsh poison from its seat before it has begun its work of death; and surrounded by conductors, the delicate and timid traveller looks without dismay on the forked messengers of destruction, twisting the spire, or rending the oak, or raging above the fear-stricken dwellings of man.

Although in wet weather the wheels of the locomotive sometimes slip upon the rails, and thus retard slightly the progress of the train, yet the delay is speedily compensated, and we may safely assert, that in all states of the weather, and in all seasons, railway travelling is equally safe and equally comfortable and expeditious. Serious and well-founded doubts were at one time entertained respecting the performance of locomotives, when such a quantity of snow lay on the rails as interrupted all the ordinary communications throughout the country; but these fears were dispelled so early as the 20th of December 1836, when snow to the depth of four or five feet had accumulated in the deep cutting through the Cowran Hill upon the Newcastle and Carlisle Railway. On the morning of that day, the Hercules engine, built in that year by R. Stephenson and Co., approached the cutting, where crowds of the people had assembled to assist in the emergency: When it reached the spot, it dashed right into the drift, clearing its way through the obstructing mass, and driving the snow over the top of the engine chimney, like foam from the surf of a violently agitated sea. In spite of this and similar obstructions, the train came down from Greenhead, *twenty miles*, in an hour and quarter, and kept its time, while all the ordinary roads were either greatly obstructed, or entirely blocked up.

It is not to be wondered at that persons of a nervous temperament, and incapable of estimating the small and calculable

amount of danger to which they are exposed on railways, should have their fears strengthened by the sight of a train of enormous length, weighing sometimes 153,300 lbs. avoirdupois, rushing at the rate of 56 miles an hour, along embankments and viaducts, and on the edge of precipices with the ocean raging at their base; and that they should absolutely prefer the stage-coach or the steam-boat, with all their discomforts and real dangers, to the luxury and repose of a first-class carriage; and still less is it to be wondered at, when they read the details of a railway accident,—or of locomotives taking to their heels and running through brick walls, like a musket ball through a paper target,—or of a collision with a luggage train, where the waggons overrode each other till the uppermost one was found piled forty feet above the rails! We admit the tendency of this knowledge to create alarm, and we sympathize with the sensitive nature which it misleads; but while we would call to the remembrance of such persons some of the frightful disasters on the ocean, in which hundreds have perished in a moment; the deadly explosion of high-pressure boilers, by which crowds of passengers have been destroyed, on board the American steamers; or the constant occurrence of stage coach and carriage accidents, when travellers were not numerous—we are anxious to prove to them that there is and can be no travelling with anything like the safety of railway conveyance. No account of the present Railway system can be correct, or even honest, without some notice of the nature and character of railway accidents; and we scruple the less to refer to some of the most frightful, because it is necessary that measures be taken, at whatever cost, to prevent their recurrence, and because we think it very probable that, if these means are taken, we may never hear again of such disasters. When we speak of railway accidents, we refer only to those which happen to passengers without any negligence on their part, and in consequence only of their travelling on a railway.

In a former Article we had occasion to mention the *increasing* safety of steam navigation as exhibited in the voyages of steamers connected with the State of New York. In the five years ending with 1824, *one* life was lost out of every 126,211 passengers; in the same period ending with 1833, *one* life was lost in every 151,931 passengers; and in the same period ending with 1838, only *one* life was lost out of 1,985,787, the safety of the passengers having increased 16½ times.* The same result has been obtained in railway travelling. According to the calculations of Baron von Reden, the following were the casualties which took place on the railways of England, France, Belgium, and Germany, between the 1st of August 1840, and July 1845:—

* See this *Journal*, vol. ix. p. 363.

England,	passenger out of	869,000	passengers, killed by his own negligence.	
France,	...	2,157,000	do.	do.
Belgium,	...	670,000	do.	do.
Germany,	...	25,000,000	do.	do.
England,	official out of	300,000	officials, killed and wounded from misconduct.	
France,	1 ...	5,000,000	do.	do.
Belgium,	1 ...	280,000	do.	do.
Germany,	1 ...	9,000,000	do.	do.
England,	1 person out of	852,000	killed from defective management.	
France,	1 ...	3,465,996	do.	do.
Belgium,	1 ...	1,690,764	do.	do.
Germany,	1 ...	12,254,858	do.	do.

The safety of railway travelling in Germany, as shewn in the above table, is very remarkable, and to us inexplicable; nor is the great loss of life on English railways less unaccountable, for it is $4\frac{1}{2}$ times greater than in France, 2 times greater than in Belgium, for passengers, and nearly 15 times greater than in Germany. If these results are correct, they inspire us at least with the hope, that all nations may now rival the Germans in the safety with which they conduct their railway operations. That railway travelling in England is approaching rapidly to that in Germany, in respect to the safety of travellers, we shall be able to show from documents that cannot be questioned. We have now before us the returns to Parliament of all the accidents which have taken place on the railways of Great Britain and Ireland for the years 1847 and 1848, and from them we obtain the following important results:—

IN 1847.

19 passengers killed, and	87 injured, from causes beyond their control.
8 do. do.	3 injured, owing to their own misconduct or incaution.
17 servants killed,	25 servants injured, from causes beyond their control.
107 do. do.	43 injured, owing to want of caution.
55 trespassers killed,	12 injured.
1 person killed,	1 injured, by crossing or standing on the line.
1 suicide.	

211 killed. 174 injured.

The number of passengers during 1847, was 54,354,019.

IN 1848.

9 passengers killed, and	128 injured, from causes beyond their own control.
12 do. do.	7 injured, owing to their own misconduct or incaution.
13 servants killed,	32 injured, from causes beyond their own control.
125 do. do.	42 injured, from misconduct or incaution.
41 trespassers killed,	10 injured, from crossing or standing on line.

202 killed. 219 injured.

The number of passengers during 1848, was 57,855,133.

If we now take the number of passengers killed from causes beyond their own control, we shall obtain the following results:—

Passengers killed.

1847,	19	or 1 out of 2,887,053 passengers.
1848,	9	or 1 out of 6,428,348 passengers.

Hence the risk of being killed was nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ times less in 1848 than in 1847, and nearly 8 times less than it was in the years 1846 and 1845, according to Baron von Reden's calculations. The comparatively great loss of life to passengers in 1847, was occasioned by the accident at Wolverton, on the 5th of November, when *seven* passengers were killed by the passenger trains running into a siding, and coming into collision with a coal train, in consequence of the negligence of the policeman; and also to the death of three passengers on the 24th of May, by the fall of part of the Railway bridge over the river Dee, when part of the train was precipitated into the water. Such disasters will, in all probability, never again occur. They have, at least, not occurred in 1848 and 1849; and we can therefore say to our timid and over-sensitive friends who refuse to travel on railways, that in the year 1848, only one passenger was killed out of *six and a half* million of passengers who travelled by Railway; and that no safer travelling than this is to be found, or can be conceived.

But while the above returns place beyond a doubt the comparative safety of passengers, they present a fearful picture of the casualties sustained by the servants of the Company and by the public. *Four hundred and thirteen* deaths, and *three hundred and ninety-three* cases of injury, in the space of *two* years, affecting, it may be, ultimately, the life or happiness of the surviving sufferers, cannot be viewed without alarm, and call loudly upon the Government and the Companies to inquire into and remove the causes by which they have been occasioned. Circumstances have led us to look at this subject with some care and anxiety. The causes which led to these disasters have been honestly inquired into by the Railway Commissioners, and are clearly set forth in their Reports; but they have not yet been viewed in their generality, and therefore no determined plan has been adopted for preventing their future operation. The evils to be remedied, are obviously such as admit of a remedy; and we are surprised that science and ingenuity and legislation have not been more earnestly required to provide a cure.

Our limits will not permit us to enter into details; but we may say in general, that Railway accidents may be arranged in two groups, namely, those which occur from imperfect mechanism, concealed from observation, and those which arise from carelessness, and from causes which either are or may be visible, and, if seen, may be prevented. If the iron girder of a bridge snaps,—if its masonry gives way,—if the tire of a wheel is thrown off,—if the bar of a rail springs,—if an axle breaks, and a boiler bursts, all these accidents are the result of imperfect mechanism. We believe that the strength of the axle and the girder, that the swelling of the boiler, had never been sufficiently tested, and

that the tire of the wheel had never been sufficiently secured ; and we hold that in all these cases the mechanist and the engineer should be held liable for the accidents which are thus occasioned, in the same manner as a lawyer and a medical man are liable for the consequences, the one of a mismanagement of his client's business, and the other of the ignorant practice of his art. At all events, axles and girders should be made doubly strong, and tires doubly secured, and boilers doubly rivetted, before they are placed in contact with human life. The experience which we are daily acquiring of the strength of materials, and of its modification by time and pressure and vibratory action, will, we are persuaded, gradually diminish the number of accidents arising from imperfect mechanism.

It is therefore against the other class of accidents,—those that produce collision, or deviation from the rails, that we require to be guarded. These collisions may arise from the trains moving in opposite or in the same direction, and from a train meeting one at rest at the station, or, as in the Wolverton accident, from the points being opened so as to conduct the train into a siding occupied by another train, or by carriages. In all these cases, the accident arises from the hostile trains not seeing each other, and not being able to stop when they do see each other. When deviations from the line of rails are occasioned by physical obstructions, by sleeping drunkards, or cattle, or trespassers, a piece of rock, or slips of earth, the accident arises from the obstructions not being seen at all, or not in time to allow the train to be stopped. In many of these cases, the collisions have taken place at *stations* where they are approached in a curve line, so that the engineer or the guard cannot possibly see the obstruction, and therefore cannot stop the train. The cure for this class of accidents is a legislative enactment to prevent any station from being placed, unless where it can be seen on both sides, and at such a distance as to allow the train to be stopped, and to alter the line of Railway, where it is not rectilinear, or nearly so at existing stations. But the great and crying evil is, that trains rush like infuriated bulls to their object, blind, or blindfolded, or unwilling to look for the obstruction which would destroy them. Trains have met in open day without seeing each other ; and one train has overtaken another, under the same ignorance of each other's existence. If ships at sea require telescopes and officers always on the watch, Railway trains doubly demand them. The engineers and guards should be provided with telescopes with a large field of view and great distinctness, and it should be their special duty to look along the line both in their front and rear, in order to observe approaching trains, or sprung rail bars, or any other obstacles in the way. When they are

seen, powerful breaks will enable them to pause in their dangerous career. The openings into sidings, the opening and closing of points, should all be indicated by visible discs, which can be seen at a distance, so that even if an official shall neglect his duty, that duty shall be indicated to the party most deeply concerned, in place of being punished after the mischief has been done. At night, the signals at these sidings and points should be illuminated, and light beacons erected at level crossings and other places, where cattle and trespassers are likely to invade the line.* It is essentially necessary, too, that when any accident happens *in* the train, such as a carriage taking fire; or when any obstruction or cause of alarm, such as a bridge on fire,† and a train rapidly advancing behind, is seen by the passengers, means should be provided of communicating with the engineer. We have used such telescopes as we have recommended; and it is surprising how distinctly even a passenger can see the line when its curvature permits it, and recognise even small stones at a distance, at which it would be easy to stop the train if a serious obstruction stood in the way. If any person would take the trouble of going over the whole class of accidents for the years 1847 and 1848, when much experimental knowledge of their cause had been acquired, he will perceive at once that the most fatal and alarming accidents would have been prevented by adopting the suggestion we have made, but especially by making it the duty of the engineer and guards to observe the line before and behind them with proper telescopes.

In concluding these observations, we must address a few words of encouragement and advice to the shareholders of Railway property. Sanguine as we are in our expectations that this property will ultimately, if not speedily, be remunerative, we are persuaded that it requires both energy and perseverance to bring about so desirable a result. We have already alluded to the necessity of economy in every department of the system—of the abandonment of all rivalry and competition between different Companies—and of an earnest and united effort to develop and turn into the railway current all the inland traffic of the Empire. This can be done only by the aid of Government, and there can be no reason why this aid should be withheld. We have seen, in the preceding pages, how noble have been the efforts of foreign

* On 10th May 1848, six passengers were killed and thirteen injured by a passenger train coming into collision with a horse-box at the Shreeham Station. The horse-box must have been invisible, or the guards blind. On the 11th June, a train, conveying troops, standing at the Crewe Station, was run into by another train, causing injury to twelve commissioned and non-commissioned officers. These are specimens of accidents from the want of watchmen with telescopes.

† This actually happened a few days ago, when the Peakirk bridge, near Boston, was completely consumed by fire.

Governments, and even of Governments with restricted means, to give facilities and security to Railway enterprise, and how, under great difficulties, they have completed many of the more important lines at their own expense. In a country like our own, whose very existence depends on the development and stability of its agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests, there is an imperative obligation on the State to uphold and complete the Railway system of the Empire. The Minister who is blind to this duty, or who shrinks from performing it, is unfit to be the Mentor of an intellectual and enterprising people. The Minister whose high destiny it is to be the Colbert of modern times will achieve to himself an immortal name, which party spirit will not dare to sully, and which every civilized people will pronounce with admiration.

Let the holders of Railway property then appeal, without delay, to a Government that has begun to open its heart and its purse to Railway enterprise, and by the wedge of the Irish half million, let them legally wrest, if they cannot obtain, from the State the means which every other Government has freely given for the completion of their lines of intercommunication. The representatives of TWO OR THREE HUNDRED MILLIONS of property have doubtless the power to command, as well as the right to claim, that which is opposed to no other interest in the Empire, but which, on the contrary, is beneficial to all;—and that spirit of enterprise which has, in many cases, adventured its all for a grand national object, will not quail before difficulties which ignorance or timidity may throw in its way.

The instalment of *ten millions*, which Lord George Bentinck so wisely asked for Irish railways, must have been advanced ere this, had he lived to persist in the demand. Ireland would then have made a successful start in the race of civilisation. English capital, attracted by the liberality of the Legislature, would have flowed more readily into her industrial channels; her indigenous fountains would have sent forth in sympathy a fuller and a warmer stream; and thus would a more copious irrigation have thrown a brighter verdure over her emerald plains. Through these arteries of iron, currents of a new and more genial blood would have rushed to her sinking heart, and the prodigal child, thus snatched from poverty and crime, would have returned regenerate and loyal into the Imperial household.

ART. XI.—1. *Papers relating to the Articles of Agreement concluded between the British Government and the Lahore Durbar, on 16th December 1846, for the Administration of the Lahore State during the Minority of the Maharajah Dhulleep Singh. 1847.*

2. *Papers relating to the Punjab. 1847-1849.*

ON the 14th of February 1846, four days after the crowning victory of Sobraon had broken the strength of the Khalsa army, and placed the Punjab at his feet, the Governor-General of India issued a proclamation, announcing that the future government of the country he had conquered would be confided to the Sikhs. In "a moment of most complete and decisive victory," he declared that he had no desire to subvert the Sikh Government—that it was his wish to see a strong native administration established at Lahore, capable of controlling its army, protecting its subjects, and securing the British frontier against those unprovoked acts of aggression which had involved the two nations in a great and sanguinary war. "If this opportunity," he added, "of rescuing the Sikh nation from military anarchy and misrule be neglected, and hostile opposition to the British army be renewed, the Government of India will make such other arrangements for the future government of the Punjab as the interests and security of the British power may render just and expedient."

On the 29th of March 1849, another Governor-General of India issued another proclamation. It announced that the Punjab had ceased to be an independent state;—that the "other arrangements" threatened by Lord Hardinge were about to be consummated by Lord Dalhousie;—that the kingdom of the Punjab was at an end;—that all the territories of Dhulleep Singh were thenceforth to be "a portion of the British empire in India;"—that the defences of every fortified place in the country, not occupied by British troops, should be totally destroyed, and "effectual means taken to deprive the people of the means of renewing either tumult or war."

How it came to pass that, after three years of mingled peace and war, the Sikhs forfeited their empire, and the British Government acquired an indisputable right to annex the Punjab to their own dominions, is a long and complicated story, as told in Blue Books and files of papers. If we can render any intelligible account of the matter within the brief space at our disposal, thrice happy shall we esteem ourselves. Within the whole circle of our Indian history, there is no more interesting—

no more pregnant chapter than this; and there is no chapter which future generations will peruse with purer pleasure or more elevated pride.

Lord Hardinge restored the Punjab to the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh. He entered Lahore not as an enemy, but as a friend and an adviser. The noble moderation which, under such trying circumstances, he evinced, has been extolled, and not grudgingly, in these pages. We have now the light of three years' experience whereby to scan the policy of 1846. We know that it has not been successful in the issue; but we know, too, that what was right in 1846 is no less right in the retrospect of 1849. We know that Lord Hardinge's benevolent desires have not been fulfilled;—we know that the Sikhs have not proved themselves worthy of the forbearance which was exercised towards them;—we know that there has been another sanguinary war, and that the British ensign now floats over the Sikh capital;—but we were never more assured than at the present moment of the wisdom and the nobility of the course pursued by Lord Hardinge, and never less inclined to regret it.

It is not to be supposed that the Governor-General regarded the re-establishment of a Sikh Government at Lahore in any other light than that of an experiment. It was an experiment which it became him to make; but no man was more conscious than Lord Hardinge that there were the seeds of failure in it, which might, under certain favourable circumstances, perish in the soil, but which, under other influences, might be rapidly developed, and fructify in due season. The proclamation, which he issued as he entered the Punjab, expressed the doubt and foreshadowed the consequences. But the probable failure of an experiment is no argument against the propriety of attempting it. Lord Hardinge left the solution of the problem, under Providence, in the hands of the Sikhs. He left it to them, to decide for themselves, whether they would retain the sovereignty of the Punjab, or suffer it to pass into the hands of the British. He told them that, so long as they consented to govern the country for themselves, without endangering the security of the British frontier, they would be left in peaceable possession of it. The fate of the Punjab was in the hands of its own rulers; and its independence was only to be forfeited by their misdeeds.

On the 11th of March 1846, an agreement was concluded between the British Government and the Lahore Durbar, by which the former pledged themselves to occupy Lahore with a body of British troops; expressly limiting the term of occupation to the "current year." This was simply a measure of clemency and protection, extended to the infant Maharajah, and his responsible

guardians, for the maintenance of their authority under circumstances which would otherwise have ended in their destruction. It was a measure which rendered safe the reorganization of that mutinous army, which had so long overawed the State. The government was ostensibly in the hands of the Maharanee Junda Kowr—the mother of Dhillup Singh, and Lal Singh, who on the departure of Golab Singh to his new kingdom of Cashmere, had been appointed to the wuzeerat. Had Lord Hardinge merely followed out, at this time, his own wishes and convictions, he would have withdrawn the British Army, and left the Sikh Government to stand or fall by itself. That it would have fallen prostrate in a month is certain. Such was the opinion of the Regent—such the opinion of the Wuzeer—such the opinion of the Durbar. Lord Hardinge consented to hold over it, until the expiration of the year, the ægis of British protection. But before the year had expired, the regent and the wuzeer were both politically dead; and a new form of government had been substituted for that under which their own vices had destroyed them.

Lal Singh was unpopular with the Durbar—unpopular with the people. He was utterly wanting in administrative talent—he was utterly wanting in integrity of character. Vicious among the vicious, he lived but for the indulgence of his own appetites, and ruled but for his own aggrandizement. He was not merely unequal to the occasion,—he might have been an able and an honest man, and yet have been found wanting in such a conjuncture,—but he was probably the worst man in the Punjab on whom the duty of reconstructing a strong Sikh government could have devolved. To do him justice, there were great difficulties in his way. He had to replenish an exhausted treasury, by a course of unpopular retrenchments. Troops were to be disbanded and jagheers resumed. Lal Singh was not the man to do this, as one bowing to a painful necessity, and sacrificing himself to the exigencies of the State. Even in a country where political virtue is but little understood, a course of duty consistently pursued for the benefit of his country, might have insured for him some sort of respect. But whilst he was impoverishing others, he was enriching himself. He was as sordid as he was profligate. The favourite of the Queen, he was the oppressor of the people. It was impossible to respect him. He was vicious to the very core. The regent chose him; and bound by treaty not to exercise any interference in the internal administration of the Lahore States, the British Government had only passively to ratify the choice. He was not raised to the Wuzeerat by Lord Hardinge, but by the Queen-mother of the Punjab, on

the part of her infant son. A strong Sikh government might have been established under another chief; it could never, without the aid of British bayonets, have been kept together by him.

The treachery of the wuzeer undid him. It had been the policy of Lord Hardinge, whilst restoring the reputed son of Runjeet Singh to the sovereignty of Lahore, to weaken the Sikh power, and to increase the security of the British Indian empire, by amputating certain limbs of the Sikh State—that is, by annexing to the British dominions the tract of country lying between the Sutlej and the Beas, known as the “Jullunder Doab;” and by erecting the hill countries of Jummoo and Cashmere into an independent principality under the government of Golab Singh. By the treaty of Lahore, of the 9th of March 1846, the Maharajah, as an equivalent for certain sums to be paid to the British Government, in defrayment of the expenses of the war, ceded to the Company in perpetual sovereignty, “all the forts, territories, rights and interests in the hill countries, which are situate between the rivers Beas and the Indus, including the provinces of Cashmere and Huzareh.” A week afterwards a treaty was entered into with Golab Singh at Umritsur, transferring the greater part of the country so purchased to that chief—the Lahore treaty having granted on the part of the Maharajah authority to the British, to enter into such an arrangement, and recognised the future independence of the new sovereign. The British Government, in a word, bought the estate from Dhulleep Singh, and sold it to Golab Singh, with the consent of the former. Thus was Golab Singh removed from Lahore. His removal was advantageous to the Punjab as it was advantageous to the British. To the people of Cashmere it was no injury. His character was not distinguished it is true by humanity of the purest kind; he had done many barbarous things in his time, and was doubtless a fierce and unscrupulous chief, not unlikely, if left to himself, to rule with a rod of iron. But whilst he was by no means more cruel and ferocious than those by whom he was surrounded, he was unquestionably an abler man and more powerful ruler. In the Punjab, ferocity of character does not always indicate strength. Golab Singh, if he was cruel, was not weak. If he had something of the tyrant about him, he had little of the sensualist. Beside the ruler of Cashmere, whom it was his to supersede, the darker shadows of his portrait lose much of their force and prominence. Sheikh Inaam-ood-deen though a courtier and a dandy, was not a mild and merciful man; but a strange mixture of the voluptuary and the ruffian, who had varied the excitements of sensuality and relieved the monotony of Zenana-dalliance by doing deeds of horror not to be paralleled in the catalogue of the crimes of

Golab Singh. Cashmere, therefore, lost nothing by the change; and the Punjab gained much. On the plains of Lahore, the last of the Jummoo brothers had the blood of kindred to avenge. It was a measure of humanity to remove him to the hills far from the reach of such temptations.

But his new sovereignty was not to be gained without a struggle. The opposition surprised and stupified him. There had always been such an understanding between Golab Singh and Sheikh Imaum-ood-deen, that the former felt well assured that the country would be handed over to him or his delegates without hesitation. But when he sent his Wuzeer, Luckput Rae, with a few regiments, to take formal possession of the country, the Sheikh delayed from week to week his departure from Cashmere, and at length assumed an attitude of overt resistance. The orders of the Lahore Durbar were disregarded; Golab Singh's troops were attacked and dispersed, and the Wuzeer was killed in the affray. When intelligence of this event reached Lahore, a Sikh army, under some of the very chiefs who had fought at Sobraon, was despatched to Cashmere; a British force, under an approved officer, Brigadier Wheeler, was ordered to march towards the disturbed districts, to protect the rear of the native army, and a reserved force to hold itself in readiness to move upon Sealkote. The British agent, Colonel Lawrence, proceeded to Cashmere, and affairs were soon brought to a crisis. His assistant, Lieutenant Edwardes, a young officer of high character and distinguished talent, who soon afterwards acquired, by a series of lustrous achievements in the field, a world-wide reputation, had some time before been despatched to Jummoo, for the purpose of instigating Golab Singh, whose energies were for a time paralyzed by this unexpected outbreak, to more vigorous measures than he had previously put forth against the recusant Sheikh. On the road to Jummoo, the Sheikh's vakeel, seeing that the tide was turning against his master, revealed to Lieutenant Edwardes what had indeed before been suspected, that the resistance of Sheikh Imaum-ood-deen was fomented by orders from Lal Singh, the Wuzeer of Lahore. The Sheikh, having heavy accounts to render, was alarmed at the prospect before him of being called to a speedy settlement; but he would not have ventured openly to resist the new Maharajah, the Lahore Durbar, and the British Government, if he had not received written instructions from Lal Singh to oppose the accession of the Jummoo chief to the sovereignty of Cashmere. The Lahore Wuzeer had not only written to the Sheikh instigating a course of conduct, which was to be accepted as an acquittance in full for all arrears due to Lahore; but ordering the chiefs and soldiery of Cashmere to be faithful to the Sheikh, and to obey

his orders. Hence the insurrection in Cashmere, which has been represented as a great national movement. The Sheikh himself was a mere tool—a ready one, for he had ends of his own to answer; and not a single native of Cashmere took up arms in the cause.

The true character of the movement was now known. Lieutenant Edwardes joined the troops of Golab Singh, and soon received intelligence that the Sheikh, perceiving the hopelessness of further resistance, and sheltered beneath the demonstrable wickedness of the Lahore Wuzeer, had determined to throw himself upon the mercy of the British Government. The Lahore troops were advancing, and before the beginning of November the two forces had formed a junction, and the British agent was at Thannah prepared to receive the submission of the repentant Sheikh. The British forces were encamped below, on the banks of the Chenab, ready to move forward to the assistance of the Sikh troops; but they were not called upon to ascend the hills. On the 1st of November Sheikh Imaum-ood-deen presented himself in the camp of the British agent at Thannah. There was no longer any doubt of the treachery of Lal Singh. Imaum-ood-deen placed in Colonel Lawrence's hands the damning epistles. The Sheikh was saved, and the Wuzeer was ruined.

It was at once determined to put Lal Singh upon his trial; and Mr. Currie, the Political Secretary, was ordered to Lahore to conduct the proceedings. It is true that the Sheikh was the ostensible prisoner, summoned before a tribunal of British officers to answer for his armed resistance to the execution of the treaties of Lahore and Umritsur. But it was plain that the line of defence adopted by the nominal culprit would "indirectly but substantially place the Wuzeer, Rajah Lal Singh, upon his trial." The mode of procedure, in such a case, it was difficult to determine. Palpable objections presented themselves to every course that was suggested; but it was at last determined that the least objectionable course would be the trial of Sheikh Imaum-ood-deen, in the presence of all the leading Sikh Sardars, by a Court composed entirely of British officers.

On the 3d of December the Court assembled. It consisted of Mr. Currie, who presided; of Sir John Littler, who commanded the troops at Lahore; Colonel Lawrence, the political agent; Mr. John Lawrence, his brother, to whom had been entrusted the charge of the Jullunder Doab; and Colonel Goldie, an intelligent officer, who commanded one of the regiments stationed in the Punjab. "The inquiry was conducted in the most open and public manner. All the leading chiefs of the most influential families, sixty-five in number, attended to witness their proceedings." They had assented to the justice of the

measure, and approved the mode of investigation. Soon after eight o'clock in the morning, the well-dressed, courteous, euphemistic Sheikh arrived from his camp at Shah-darrah. The proceedings commenced; the Sheikh adduced the evidence in his favour. There was little or nothing of the formality of a criminal trial. The Court sat there to arbitrate between two parties—to hear their several statements—and to decide upon the weight to be attached to the evidence adducible by either. The first day was given up to the witnesses on the side of Sheikh Inaam-ood-deen. On the second day the Durbar entered on its defence. When the evidence had been given on both sides, the Court adjourned to the President's tent for the delivery of the verdict. All the Durbar chiefs, with the exception of Lal Singh, were invited to attend, with some other leading Sirdars. The President then carefully and deliberately went through the whole of the evidence, and announced the decision of the Court, as based on the instructions of the Governor-General. The Sirdars were informed that the evidence against Lal Singh was conclusive; but that, if the other chiefs disclaimed all participation in the act of treachery, it was not the intention of the British Government to visit the offence upon the Lahore State, but personally upon the Wuzer, whose deposition would be demanded. One and all the Sikh chiefs bore witness to the justice of the decision, and determined upon the removal of the treacherous Rajah from the Wuzerat. No time was lost. Lal Singh was at once declared a prisoner, and escorted from the Durbar tent to his own house by a guard of Sikh soldiers. The charge of the fort and palace of Lahore was made over to Tej Singh, Shere Singh, and the Dewan Deena Nath; and the seal of the Maharajah, at the request of these officers, was deposited in the hands of Colonel Lawrence.

So fell Rajah Lal Singh; but not without an effort on the part of the Maharanee to save her paramour. He had, for some time, been the favourite of this unprincipled woman, and was never, perhaps, more securely seated in her affections than at the hour of his downfall. With his commanding stature, his athletic frame, his handsome countenance, instinct with that voluptuous expression which pleases women of a certain class, with his bold, dashing, abandoned manner, and all the unscrupulousness of a practised intriguer, he had attracted, during the wuzerat of Heera Singh, the attention of the Maharanee Junda Kowr, and weaned her from her former attachments. She was in want of a new lover—in want of one equally inclined to amorous and to political intrigue, and she found in Lal Singh a man after her own heart, both for purposes of business and of pleasure. If it was ever in the nature of this bold bad woman to be true to any

one she was true to Lal Singh. His disgrace exasperated and alarmed her; for she felt that she must fall with him. His removal to the British provinces, which had been determined upon as a measure of security, cut her to the heart. She remonstrated—she implored; she appealed to the Sikh and to the British authorities in behalf of the fallen Rajah; but the fiat had gone forth for his expulsion, and not hers the voice that could obtain a revocation of the sentence. The political existence of Lal Singh was at an end; and with it perished all the power of his leman.

And now what was to become of the Sikh Government? The day was fast approaching for the fulfilment of the terms of the supplementary treaty of Lahore. The Governor-General had declared, and still adhered to, his determination, to withdraw the British army from the Punjab at the end of the current year; and now December had arrived. The Durbar could not but perceive that the retirement of the British was an event only too surely calculated to be the precursor of new troubles. The strong Sikh government, which it was so desirable to establish, seemed farther off than ever. In this strait, the Maharajah, in reply to a letter from the Governor-General, was made to importune the British Government, after the end of the year, just to leave, for his protection, a small brigade—two battalions of infantry, a cavalry regiment, and a few guns. A single company would have been something. It would have given to the Sikh Government the prestige of British support; but it was precisely that which the Governor-General was least of all inclined to give. It was his wise resolve to support the Maharajah effectually or not at all. To leave at Lahore a small force, any accident to which would have compromised our reputation—would have been, in the eyes of all the States of Asia, a disaster and a disgrace—was a course to which nothing short of the most overwhelming madness could have impelled the British viceroy. The Sikh Durbar, with utter ruin staring it in the face, as “the current year, A.D. 1846,” wore to a close, continued to importune the British Government for aid, and was willing to pay any price for its protection. By the treaties of March the Governor-General had pledged himself not to interfere in the internal administration of the State, whilst he was supporting the Sikh Government at the point of our British bayonets; but no man was, on principle, ever more averse to the system itself, which he had yielded to as a temporary expedient. To continue any longer to put forth the military strength of the British empire in support of measures for which he was in no wise responsible, and for the protection of men whose conduct he could not control, and in whose characters he had not confidence, would have been an

act of injustice and inhumanity altogether abhorrent to the benevolent nature of Lord Hardinge. He determined, therefore, that if the people of the Punjab were to be controlled by a British army they should have the benefit of British counsels. The only terms, it was stated to the Sikh chiefs, on which British protection could be afforded to the Maharajah and the Durbar, were that a British officer, "with an efficient establishment of subordinates," should be appointed by the Governor-General in council, "to direct and control every department of the State." A Council of Regency, consisting of eight Sirdars, was to be nominated to act under the instructions of the British resident; and no changes in the Regency were to be effected without the sanction of that functionary. By this arrangement, which was to have effect during the minority of the Maharajah, "unlimited authority in all matters of internal administration and external relations" was given to the British Resident. But the offer was willingly embraced by the Sikh chiefs; and Colonel Lawrence became the virtual ruler of the Punjab.

The terms stated—with the further agreement that a pension of a lakh and a half of rupees should be conferred on the Maharane, who was excluded from all share in the Government, and that twenty-two lakhs per annum should be paid by the Sikhs for the hire of the British troops—were formally embodied into a treaty, which, having been executed on the 16th of December, by Mr. Currie and Colonel Lawrence, on the part of the British, and by Tej Singh, Shere Singh, and others, on the part of the Sikhs, was ratified at Bhyrowal on the 26th of the same month, by the Maharajah and the Governor-General, in the camp of the latter. The Governor-General was attended by Lord Gough and his staff; the Maharajah by Tej Singh, Shere Singh, and other Sirdars, with their respective retinues. There appeared to have been no hesitation, no unwillingness on the part of the Sikh chiefs to enter into this new compact. They voluntarily and cheerfully confided the administration of their affairs to the British Resident, whilst they trusted in the presence of the British army to preserve their country in peace and their government from destruction. They flung themselves, indeed, at our feet, and sued for protection. They acknowledged both our justice and our power, and virtually declared that nothing else could save the Punjab from anarchy and confusion. People of all classes appeared to be well pleased with these arrangements; and it is probable that the only persons in the State who viewed them with feelings of resentment were the Queen and her degraded paramour; and for a time, at least, they appeared to be thoroughly successful, and to fill all men with hope and confidence.

In the spring of 1847, the political horizon was almost unclouded. The Governor-General, in his letters to the Secret Committee of the East India Company, continued to report that the Sikh authorities composing the Durbar appeared to be carrying on the government of the country with a sincere desire to secure a successful result; that everything was perfectly quiet, and that nothing had occurred worthy of remark. The Sikh soldiery appeared to be contented, and were gradually acquiring habits of order and obedience, under a system which rendered them dependent on the British officers for whatever most promoted their happiness and comfort. But it did not escape the sagacious understanding of the Resident, that serene as was the present aspect of affairs, and promising as were the appearances of continued tranquillity, there were beneath all this surface-calm dangerous elements at work waiting only for time to call them into full activity. The memory of frequent and disastrous defeat was then too fresh upon the humbled Khalsa to suffer them to indulge in visions of reacquiring their lost supremacy; but as the impression waxed dim and more dim, the danger would become more imminent, and outbursts of desperate Asiatic zeal might be looked for in quarters where such paroxysms had long seemed to be almost necessary to the very social existence of a lawless and tumultuous class. "In the course of time," wrote Colonel Lawrence, "if opportunity be given, the national independence of the Sikh character may dictate the attempt to escape from under a foreign yoke; for, however benevolent be our motives, and conciliatory our demeanour, a British army cannot garrison Lahore, and the fiat of a British functionary cannot supersede that of the Durbar throughout the land, without our presence being considered a burden and a yoke, not only by those who have nothing to lose, and all to gain by revolution, but by many of the bolder spirits among the better classes, who are ready to venture their lives and their property in the cause of the Khalsa, and in the chances of a revolution which may make Generals, Sirdars, and even a Maharajah." And then he said that he saw around him, struggling for existence, so many high officers of the old Sikh armies; so many favourites of the old line of Wuzceers—from Dhyān Singh to Lal Singh—now cast adrift in the world, without resources and without hope under the existing system, that, when he remembered their lawless habits, their headstrong folly, their desperate suicidal zeal, he only wondered at the perfect peace which then pervaded the land.

It was a season of prosperity—a time of promise; and the best uses were made by the British functionaries of this continued calm. Their interference in the civil administration of

the country was only exercised when it could be turned to the unquestionable advantage of the people. British authority and British integrity were then employed in the settlement of long unsettled districts, and in the development of the resources of long-neglected tracts of country. The subordinate officers, who were deputed for such special purposes, were instructed to lose no opportunity of acquiring any description of information, and to report freely, not only upon the agricultural and commercial capabilities of the districts they visited, but anything that was worthy of record in connexion with science or art. The Governor-General, among other benevolent efforts, directed that an engineer officer should be deputed to report upon the practicability of opening the canal between Lahore and Umritsur; and whilst everything was being done to advance the general prosperity of the people, and to ensure the popularity of British occupation among the industrial classes, the army was propitiated by the introduction of new and improved systems of pay and pension, and taught to believe, that what they had lost in opportunities of plunder, and in irregular largesses, had been more than made up to them by certainty and punctuality of payment, and the interest taken by the British officers in the general welfare of the soldier. And all this seemed to have its effect. Lieutenant Edwardes reported, to the honour of the Sikh army that accompanied him to Bunnoo, that the best-disciplined soldiers of the most civilized nation of Europe never marched through so rich a country with so little license; and Major George Lawrence wrote from Peshawur, as a proof of the confidence reposed in British superintendence, that the soldiery were bringing in their money to be remitted through his treasury, in preference to their own pay-office; and were anxious to remain at Peshawur, a post which had always been regarded by the Sikhs as little better than a place of banishment.

As the year advanced, these favourable appearances rather improved than deteriorated. In June, the Resident reported that a large majority of the disbanded soldiers had returned to the plough or to trade; and that the advantages of British influence to the cultivating classes were every day becoming more apparent. Still he did not close his eyes to the fact, that although the spirit of insurrection was at rest in the Punjab, it was not yet dead. There were sparks flying about here and there, which alighting on combustible materials, might speedily excite a blaze. It was not to be expected by the most sanguine, that after so many years of unrest and anarchy, the Sikhs should at once subside into a state of apathetic repose. "If every Sirdar and Sikh in the Punjaub," wrote Colonel Lawrence, with the candour and good sense which are so conspicuous in his communications,

“were to avow himself satisfied with the humbled position of his country, it would be the extreme of infatuation to believe him; or to doubt for a moment, that among the crowd who are loudest in our praise, there are many who cannot forgive our victory, or even our forbearance, and who chafe at their own loss of power in exact proportion as they submit to ours.” People were not wanting even then, in our camp, to talk with ominous headshakings of the “Cabul catastrophe,” and to predict all sorts of massacres and misfortunes. But there was no parallel to be drawn between the two cases; and an overweening sense of security had not taken possession of the British functionaries at Lahore. The Governor-General continued to report, from fortnight to fortnight, to the home authorities, that affairs continued in a most satisfactory state, and that there was a progressive improvement in the civil and military administration of the country. And no men ever deserved success better than Colonel Lawrence and his assistants; for whilst the British officers employed in the provinces of the Punjab were zealous in well-doing, conciliating all classes by measures of justice and humanity, and a general regard for the interests and the happiness of men accustomed, under the old system of Sikh administration, to oppression of the worst kind, at the capital the leading Sirdars were propitiated by that “cheap defence of nations,” the bestowal of honorary rewards and distinctions; and if any expectation of continued tranquillity could be based upon the fact, that it was undeniably the interest of the people to maintain it, we might reasonably have looked for a protracted season of peace. But the Resident knew well that little was to be expected from Sikh gratitude; and much from the irrepressible turbulence of the Sikh character. It was not in the nature of things that, under the operation of any humanizing measures, the Sikhs should cease to be Sikhs in a year. It would require many years of incessant vigilance, of continued perseverance in well-doing, and of the most delicate diplomatic tact, to inspire confidence and awaken a reciprocity of kindly feeling in the breasts of a people who naturally regarded us with suspicion and mistrust. And, at the best, we were interlopers in the Punjab; however easy might be the yoke, it would be a yoke still; and the spirit of independence is not extinguished by a sense of benefits received.

We shall be pardoned if we dwell yet a little longer, before we pass on to the narration of more exciting historical events, upon the many gratifying circumstances which distinguished this year of tranquillity in the country of the Five Rivers. These circumstances are of peculiar interest at the present time. They foreshadow the future administrative history of the

Punjab. They are an earnest of the good that will be done, now that the country is subject to our rule. In 1847, Colonel Lawrence was the virtual ruler of Lahore. The Durbar officers, though nominally members of the Government, were in reality little more than cyphers. The British officers employed under the Resident were few; but they were men of no common ability and energy of character. They had great confidence in their chief, and their chief had great confidence in them. Acting, with one or two exceptions, for the majority were soldiers, in a mixed civil and military character, they managed to confer benefits on all classes; and alike by their courage and their integrity to elevate the national character. One common spirit of humanity seemed to animate the Governor-General, the Resident, and his assistants. Infanticide, suttee, and the odious traffic for the vilest purposes in female slaves, were suppressed. In the agricultural districts, a system of enforced labour, which had pressed heavily on the Ryots, was also in course of abolition. The weak were everywhere protected against the strong. An entire revision of the judicial and revenue systems of the country—if systems they can be called, where system there was none—was attempted, and with good success. New customs' rules were prepared, by which the people were greatly gainers. Every legitimate means of increasing the revenue, and of controlling unnecessary expenditure, were resorted to, and large savings were effected at no cost of efficiency in any department of the State. The cultivators were encouraged to sink wells, to irrigate their lands, and otherwise to increase the productiveness of the soil, alike to their own advantage and the profit of the State. The Sikhs were unaccustomed to be governed after this fashion, and, doubtless, the good intentions of the British functionaries were but imperfectly understood. Still these measures had the effect of restoring confidence in many quarters, and in bringing back refugees to their native homes. "The country," wrote Major George Lawrence from Peshawur to the Resident, "is wonderfully quiet. Many Zemindars and Ryots, who had fled from the oppression of years, have returned, and others are daily returning. One old lady has written me from Kooner, that, in consequence of what she hears, she intends returning, to lay her bones with her ancestors at Chump Kumry, the village of the infamous Kumroodeen Khan."

But whilst the country remained tranquil, and the Durbar officers submissive, there was one person in the Punjab to whose nature tranquillity and submissiveness were alike foreign. There was one person whose movements the Resident watched with suspicion, and with whom he found it somewhat difficult to deal. This was the Ranee Junda Kowr. We have shewn that this un-

principled and intriguing woman had been removed from all participation, direct or indirect, in the affairs of government, and that a lakh and a half of rupees (£15,000) per annum had been settled upon her, that she might pass her days in honourable retirement. But the Ranee was by no means disposed to retire into private life. She gave interviews to the Sirdars, without the modesty of the *Purdah*, and held vast levees of Brahmins, feeding them, and washing their feet. So unbecoming the mother of the Maharajah was the woman's conduct, that the Resident thought it right to interfere. He wrote to her, pointing out the impropriety of receiving strangers within her private apartments, and suggesting the expediency of following a more feminine and more decorous line of conduct. It would be difficult to conceive a more characteristic effusion than her answer to the Resident's letter. Very saucy and very clever, it was ironically polite; bristling with sarcasms, like a masked battery, pointed at the British Government, the Resident, and the Regency Sirdars. "It is a subject of deep congratulation to me," she wrote in conclusion, "that both the Maharajah and myself are now reaping the benefits of the friendship which Maharajah Runjeet Singh sowed with the Company. Continue, if you please, to give me your advice." The letter amused the British Resident; it offended the Sirdars. But the royal lady was not one to rest satisfied with such opportunities as this of displaying her wit. She had more important work in hand. She had opened communications with the Dewan of Mooltan, under the pretext of sending an emissary—a confidential slave-girl—to that place, for the ostensible purpose of procuring a white "ak" tree, (*swallow-wort*), "said to be of great virtue in incantations;" and she was more than suspected of having hatched a conspiracy for the murder of Tej Singh and Colonel Lawrence. Every effort was made to sift this latter business to the bottom. It was proved that there had been a design to murder the Sirdar and the Resident; and that the Maharanee's confidential secretary had been in communication with the chief conspirator. The Governor-General did not think the evidence against the Maharanee conclusive; but agreed with the Resident in opinion that her evil intentions were sufficiently apparent to render her removal from Lahore a justifiable and an expedient measure. He decreed, therefore, that an asylum should be found for her on the Punjaabee side of the Sutlej, until such time as further revolutionary intrigues should render necessary her removal to Hindostan. The regency Sirdars, who had been unwilling to incur the responsibility of such a measure, were assured by the decided tone of the Governor-General, and gave their consent to the woman's removal to Sheikopoor, a fort "situated in a quiet part of the

country, away from the high road, and in the midst of a Mussulman population." The brother of the Maharanee, Sirdar Heera Singh, was deputed to convey the tidings of her banishment to the royal lady. She said that she was ready for anything; and preparations were at once made for her journey. The young Maharajah received the tidings of his mother's removal with indifference. When the news was broken to him he went on playing, and sent the Resident his salaam.

On the 20th of August a proclamation was issued, announcing the removal of the Maharanee, for the better preservation both of the peace of the country and the morals of the Maharajah. On the following day Colonel Lawrence, whose health had been for some time declining, left Lahore to seek renewed strength in the cool mountain air of Simlah. His brother, Mr. John Lawrence, a distinguished member of the Company's civil service—a service never wanting in officers of first-rate administrative talent—was appointed to perform the duties of the Residency during his temporary absence.

Lahore continued tranquil. The departure of the Maharanee created no sort of excitement. She was conveyed to Sheikoo-poor, chafing under the indignity that had been put upon her, but openly professing herself well pleased with the change. The custody of her Highness was proposed, at the instance of the Durbar, to Sirdar Shere Singh; but that chief declined to take upon himself so responsible and delicate an office. He soon had reason to congratulate himself on his determination. The Maharanee speedily began to tamper with her guards, and to endeavour, unsuccessfully, to intrigue with Golab Singh in Cashmere. That prince continued to give satisfaction to the British Government. The measures of reform suggested by Colonel Lawrence had been carried out with obvious good faith; and the Maharajah continued to assure the Resident of his desire to govern his new possessions in a spirit of humanity hitherto unknown to that romantic land. The inhuman rites of suttee and infanticide were abolished by proclamation; some oppressive monopolies were abandoned; and the rights of the people acknowledged as they had never been acknowledged before.

On the 17th of October Colonel Lawrence returned to Lahore. The Dusserah festival fell on the 19th, and was celebrated with great pomp by the Maharajah and the Durbar. Everything passed off most happily. "The little Maharajah did the honours of his situation most gracefully, and was in particularly good spirits." The Resident, Sir John Littler, and many of the officers of the garrison, attended the Durbar; their scarlet uniforms contrasting with the brilliant yellow dresses of the Sikh courtiers, and making a splendid and imposing spectacle. "It

was a great change from last year," remarked the Resident, in a letter to Government, "when Rajah Lal Singh, apparently afraid to make his appearance in public, had all the pageantry and pomp of the Dusserah confined to the inner court of the palace, to which the multitude had no access." Now the Maharajah went out attended by the British Resident and a numerous *cortège* of English and Sikh officers, to meet his people at a distance from the city.

The months of October and November passed quietly away; but a great and important change was impending. Lord Hardinge was about to lay down the reins of Government; and Colonel Lawrence, urged by his medical attendants no longer to delay resorting to the only remedy which was calculated to arrest the progress of disease in his failing constitution, was about to visit his native country for a season. It was with extreme reluctance that he consented to quit his post and to accompany Lord Hardinge to England. He went; and Sir Frederick Currie, who, in the capacity of political secretary, had accompanied, in 1845, Lord Hardinge to the banks of the Sutlej—who had presided, as we have seen, at the trial of Lal Singh—and who had been subsequently created a baronet and appointed a member of the Supreme Council of India, was nominated to act as Resident at Lahore. He was a public servant of approved talent and integrity; but there were not wanting those who thought that, during the year of Colonel Lawrence's absence, the management of affairs might more advantageously have been entrusted to Mr. John Lawrence, who had already had charge of the Residency, who was thoroughly acquainted with his brother's views, and who had unmistakably evinced the possession of a high order of administrative talent.

Meeting the stream of European revolution as they journeyed homewards, Lord Hardinge and Colonel Lawrence came overland to England in the early spring of 1848. Brief space is allowed to us for comment; but before we cease to write Lord Hardinge's name in connexion with Sikh politics and history, we must give expression, if only in a single sentence, to the admiration with which we regard his entire policy towards the Punjab. It was worthy of a Christian warrior; it was worthy of a Christian statesman. It is in nowise to be judged by results—still less by accidents which were not the results of the original policy, but of subsequent errors. What Lord Hardinge did, he did because it was right to do it. Our sense of his forbearance under provocation, of his moderation in the hour of victory, has already been recorded in this Journal. His subsequent measures were in harmony with the temper of this majestic mildness. It was his one desire to render British connexion with the Punjab

a blessing to the people. The spirit of Christian philanthropy moved over the face of the country. The evidences of this truth are strewn thickly over the opening pages of the last Parliamentary Blue Book. The reader will do well to turn to them.

The new year seemed to commence auspiciously in the Punjab. The attention of the British functionaries was principally directed to the settlement of the land-revenue and the improvement of the judicial system of the country. They had begun codifying in good earnest; and laws, civil and criminal, grew apace under their hands. Everything appeared to be tranquil, and to promise continued tranquillity. There was little in the state of things to call for especial remark from the Governor-General, who, in his letters to the Secret Committee, contented himself with the observation, that he "forwarded papers relating to the Punjab." But early in May intelligence had reached Calcutta which impelled him to indite a more stirring epistle. We are now approaching eventful times.

In September 1844, Sawun Mull, the able and energetic Dewan of Mooltan, was shot to death by an assassin. He was succeeded in the Dewannee by his son Moolraj, who had also earned for himself the reputation of a chief, with more just and enlightened views of government, and greater administrative talent, than distinguish the majority of his countrymen. But it so happened that he had another sort of reputation: he was reputed to be very rich. Sawun Mull, it was said, had amassed immense treasures in Mooltan; and on the instalment of his son in the Dewannee, the Lahore Durbar demanded "Nuzzurana," or tributary gifts, to the extent of no less than a million of money. The exorbitant claim was rejected; but a compromise was entered into with the Imperial Government, by which Moolraj became bound to pay to Lahore less than a fifth of the sum named. And this sum would have been paid, but for the convulsions which soon began to rend the country, and the disasters which befell the Durbar.

On the re-establishment of the Sikh Government, the claim was renewed. It was intimated to the Dewan that if the stipulated eighteen lakhs, with certain amounts due for arrears, were paid into the Lahore Treasury, he should be allowed to continue in charge of Mooltan; but that if he demurred, troops should be sent to coerce him. He refused payment of the money, and troops were accordingly sent against him. Thus threatened, he besought the British Government to interfere in his favour, and consented to adjust the matter through the arbitration of the Resident. The result was, that he came to Lahore in the autumn of 1846; promised to pay by instalments the money claimed; and was mulcted in a portion of the territories from

which he had drawn his revenue ; and the remainder farmed out to him for a term of three years. He appeared, however, to be satisfied with the arrangement—was anxious to obtain the guarantee of the British authorities, but was obliged to return to Mooltan without it. Mr. Lawrence, who was then officiating for his brother, refused to do more than witness the agreement.

For the space of more than a year, Moolraj remained in peaceful occupation of the country which had been leased out to him. There was no attempt, on the part of the British functionaries, to interfere with the affairs of Mooltan. That territory was especially exempted from the operation of the revenue settlement, which had taken effect elsewhere ; and the new customs' regulations which had been established in the Punjab were not extended to Mooltan. But the compact which had been entered into with the Lahore Durbar did not sit easily upon him. He thought, or affected to think, that its terms were too rigorous ; and accordingly, about the close of 1847, he repaired to the capital to seek some remission of them. He soon began intriguing with the Durbar for the reduction of the stipulated rents ; and not coming to any satisfactory arrangement, intimated to Mr. Lawrence his wish to resign a charge which he had found so little profitable. Mr. Lawrence told him that he would accept his resignation when formally tendered ; but recommended him to reflect upon the subject before finally coming to a determination, which could not be subsequently revoked. Some further negotiations took place ; but as the arrival of Sir Frederick Currie was daily expected, Mr. Lawrence was instructed by the Governor-General to leave the final settlement of the question to that officer. Upon this, a letter was addressed to Moolraj, who had previously quitted Lahore, asking whether he desired any communication to be made to Sir Frederick Currie. On the day that the new Resident reached Lahore the answer of the Dewan was received. It embodied, in no very intelligible manner, a resignation of the Nizamut of Mooltan on certain conditions, said to have been acceded to by Mr. Lawrence. But these conditions had not been acceded to, and the intentions of Moolraj were not very apparent ; so a letter was despatched to him, in which he was required to state, in distinct terms, the resolution at which he had arrived. The answer was a definitive resignation ; and the Durbar at once appointed a successor. Sirdar Khan Singh, who was described as " a brave soldier and intelligent man," was nominated to the Governorship of Mooltan on a fixed annual salary. At the same time, Mr. Agnew, a civil servant of the Company, was appointed political agent at Mooltan, and Lieutenant Anderson of the Bom-

bay army, nominated his assistant. "Mr. Agnew," wrote the Governor-General to the Secret Committee of the India Company, "a most zealous and intelligent servant of the Government, had acquired a considerable reputation for his tact in the management of the natives of the country, and for a thorough acquaintance with their character and habits. Lientenant Anderson was known as an excellent Oriental scholar, and had been employed with credit under Sir Charles Napier in Scinde."

"The unhappy fate," adds the Governor-General, "of these promising officers must ever be deplored." They were despatched to Mooltan with Khan Singh, the new Governor, and an escort of five hundred men, to receive charge of the place. On their arrival before the city there were no symptoms of any hostile intentions on the part of its occupants. Moolraj himself waited on the British officers on the 18th of April, and promised to conduct them over the Fort on the following day. "Everything," wrote Mr. Agnew, "seems to bear out the character Mooltan has ever borne for peace and quietness." On the morning of the 19th, accompanied by Moolraj, the British officers inspected the Fort. Two companies of Goorkhas and some horsemen, belonging to the escort, attended them from their camp, and were placed in possession of one of the Fort-gates. The crisis was now at hand. Moolraj formally gave over charge of the Fort; and as the party retired through the gate the British officers were suddenly attacked and wounded. Moolraj, who was riding with them at the time, offered no assistance, but, setting spurs to his horse, galloped off in the direction of his garden-house, whilst the wounded officers were carried to their own camp by Khan Singh and a party of the Goorkhas.

In the course of the following day all the Mooltanee troops were in a state of open insurrection. Moolraj himself, who may not have been guilty in the first instance of an act of premeditated treachery, and who subsequently pleaded that he was coerced by his troops, sent excuses to Mr. Agnew, who, with the generous confidence of youth, acquitted him of all participation in the outrage. But he was soon heart and soul in the work. The wounded officers occupied a mosque, in an *edga* or cantonment not far from the Fort, and there the enemy's guns soon began to play upon them. The firing was answered from the guns of the Sikh escort, under Esra Singh; but the fidelity of this officer was not proof against the temptation to which it was exposed. The emissaries of Moolraj did their work of corruption with unerring effect. Before nightfall Esra Singh, with all his men, went over to the enemy. The mosque was surrounded. A motley crew of ruffians—soldiers and citizens—men of all classes,

young and old, moved by one common impulse, one great thirst of blood, came yelling and shouting around the abode of those doomed Englishmen. In they rushed, with a savage cry, and surrounded their victims. The wounded officers lay armed on their beds, and, helpless as they were in this extremity, put on the bold front of intrepid Englishmen, and were heroes to the very last. Having shaken hands, and bade each other a last farewell, they turned upon their assailants as best they could; but were overpowered, and barbarously murdered. One Goodhur Singh, a deformed wretch, with a crippled hand, described as "an object disgusting to behold," struck thrice at Agnew's neck with a sword, and at the third blow cut off his head. Anderson was hacked to death by a number of savage wretches, who flung themselves upon him with their swords; and, the slaughter thoroughly accomplished, the two bodies were dragged out of the mosque, and savagely mutilated by the murderers. Goodhur Singh carried Agnew's head in triumph to Moolraj, who, in grateful acknowledgment of the act, presented the assassin with the horse and pistol of the murdered man, and ordered the head to be thrown into the lap of Khan Singh,* who had been taken prisoner and carried to the Dewan. Nor was that all. It is added, that the nostrils and mouth of what was once young Agnew were filled with gunpowder, and then ignited; and that Moolraj enjoyed and applauded the hellish joke.

Whatever may have been the designs of Moolraj—whatever may have been his conduct previous to the murder of the British officers, he was now, willingly or unwillingly, in a position from which there was no retreating. Whether he had in any way instigated the foul act, or was, as there is reason to believe, innocent of the murderous intention, he approved of it when done, and stood irretrievably committed in the eyes both of our countrymen and his own. He seems at once to have seen that there was no going back, that one only course was open to him—a hazardous one, which he would not himself have chosen, but which, once entered on, admitted of no pause and left no time for reflection. All the dormant energies of his nature were now

* There is something inexplicable in the relations subsisting between these two worthies. When many months afterwards Mooltan was besieged, Khan Singh was still in confinement. Yet both, it is said, were engaged in a plot for the subversion of British supremacy in the Punjab. Khan Singh is supposed to have been a tool of the Maharanee. It had been concerted, before he accepted the governorship of Mooltan, that he should create a disturbance there after the departure of Moolraj, in such a manner, and at such a time, as to withdraw the British troops from Lahore, and so lay bare the capital to the insurgents. But he is said to have endeavoured to save Anderson and Agnew, who generously told him to make terms for himself; and to have been deeply affected by their death.

called into full activity. They who knew him best had never previously regarded him as a man of very high courage—bold, resolute, equal to the accomplishment of great deeds and the defiance of great dangers. And it is probable that the notorious part which he was called upon to act at no time sat easily upon him. Had retreat become possible he would have retreated. But he was, from the first, the victim of circumstances—a hero in spite of himself; and in the energy of desperation he reached a height of daring which none had before thought himself capable of attaining. Once committed to the conflict with the British, he threw himself cordially into the work which he had been singled out by Providence to accomplish. He took command of the insurgents—identified himself with their cause—bestowed largesses upon the men who had been most active in the assault upon the British officers, retained all who would take service with him, laid in stores, collected money, and addressed letters to other chiefs urging them to resistance. He had never been looked upon by others—never regarded himself, as a man to become the leader of a great national movement; but now circumstances had done for him what he would never willingly have shaped out for himself; he bowed to fate, and became a hero.

In the meanwhile, intelligence of the attack upon the British officers reached Lahore; and the Resident at once determined to despatch a British force to Mooltan, to support the authority of the Durbar, and to chastise the insurgents. A requisition for troops was sent to the officer commanding the division; but on the following day, further advices were received from Mooltan which caused Sir Frederick Currie to abandon the design which he had formed in the first instance, and to countermand the march of the British force. It was too clear, from the information he received, that Agnew and Anderson had been murdered, and that the Durbar troops had gone over in a body to the insurgents. The Sikh battalions which were proceeding to Mooltan would, in all probability, follow the example of Khan Singh's escort, and the British brigade would be surrounded by false friends, only waiting a fitting opportunity to declare themselves open enemies. To send a small body of British troops on so hazardous an expedition, appeared to the Resident a measure which he would not be justified in adopting. He intimated, therefore, to the chiefs of the Durbar regiments, that they must march unsupported to Mooltan; but they were fain to decline the honour. They could not rely on their troops. To send them to act against Moolraj would only be to swell the number of his adherents. The Resident seems to have acknowledged the force of this; but it was obviously necessary that something should be done to vindicate the authority of the Sikh Durbar, and to punish

the gross outrage committed upon the British Government. In this emergency the Resident addressed himself to the Commander-in-Chief, stating the political urgency of the case, and leaving it to him to determine, at that advanced season of the year—it was the end of April—the possibility of commencing operations for the reduction of Mooltan. The Commander-in-Chief determined that it was impossible; and the spirit of insurrection was suffered to diffuse itself over the whole length and breadth of the land.

There is much, doubtless, to be said upon this subject; but after the case has been justly stated on both sides, and all the official evidence fairly weighed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, that a great mistake was committed. The Commander-in-Chief was at Simlah; the Governor-General at Calcutta. A reference to the latter would have occasioned a month's delay; an answer from the former could be received in less than a week. The Resident, therefore, who shrunk from the possible risk of ordering a body of British troops to commence extensive military operations at the most hostile season of the year, with a prospect of failure staring them in the face, transferred the responsibility to the Commander-in-Chief, who distinctly pronounced operations to be impossible. The Governor-General in Council confirmed this resolution. "We are far," he wrote to the Secret Committee, "from wishing to throw on the Resident or the Commander-in-Chief the responsibility of having decided this important question. We desire, therefore, to express our entire concurrence in the views expressed by his Excellency and by the Resident at Lahore." The weight of official authority was all against an immediate movement; but public opinion was decidedly in its favour. It was alleged in defence of the authorities, that a movement in the hot weather would have been fatal to the troops—that, partly on that account, and partly because the force then sent must necessarily have been comparatively weak, the risk of failure was great—and that, as risings were anticipated in the neighbourhood of Lahore, as the outbreak in Mooltan was only part of an extensively ramified conspiracy, it would have been an act of extreme folly to denude that part of the country of the troops which were so much needed. Now, as regards the last of these apologetic statements, to which we should have attached the greatest weight, it might have been taken on credit before the revelations of the Parliamentary Blue Book were before the world; but now we are bound to say, that this consideration of a storm about to burst over the capital formed no distinct part of the reasons alleged for the delay of active operations. The Resident at Lahore said nothing about it—the Commander-in-Chief said nothing about it—the Governor-General said no-

thing about it.* It was discovered afterwards that a conspiracy, to which we have alluded in a note to a former page, had been hatched by the Maharanee and others, the design of which was to strip Lahore of troops, by means of disturbances at Mooltan ; but even this story, which did not transpire till long after the question of commencing military operations had been settled, was never divested entirely of the apocryphal character which it first assumed. The Resident, whose own judgment evidently inclined towards the immediate commencement of hostilities, though averse from incurring the responsibility* of moving the troops, spoke mainly of the possible evils of sufferings from the climate and a suspension of operations once commenced, whilst in much stronger language he set forth the certain evils of delay. The Commander-in-Chief spoke of little but the advanced season of the year ; and the Governor-General in Council remarked that, "however imminent may be the risk that, if the British troops do not now move, insurrection, apparently successful for a time at Mooltan, may extend its influence over the Punjab, and may cause disturbance and revolt throughout its bounds, we yet think that the dangers which would thence arise to British interests in India are far less than those which would be created by our being compelled to discontinue operations once begun before they had been brought to a satisfactory termination ; and by the fearful loss among the troops which is anticipated as the consequence of entering on military operations, on the scale required in such a district as Mooltan, in such a season of the year." Such are the grounds upon which the commencement of active operations was delayed until a local outbreak had become a great national insurrection—until the original offender, who might easily have been crushed in May, had become a formidable opponent in December—until, warned by our inactivity, the great serpent egg had been hatched, and the oft-defeated Khalsa had gained new courage, and begun to despise an enemy which had rested many months under an unresented outrage, the most

* The Resident, it is true, wrote, "It would not be expedient at the present moment to take from the force at Lahore any troops, without supplying their place from other quarters ; except perhaps one of the Royal regiments. The 53d is so strong that a wing would be sufficient for the Anarkullee cantonment, whilst the other wing might occupy the quarters in the city ;" and the Commander-in-Chief said that he concurred in the inexpediency of weakening Lahore, "under the very uncertain disposition of the Sikh army described" by the Resident. But all the Resident said about the Sikh army was, that it could not be entrusted to carry Mooltan without the support of the British ; and it by no means appears to have been the opinion of the authorities that there were any good grounds for expecting an outbreak at that particular time. Indeed, in a subsequent paper, it is distinctly stated by the Governor-General, that "the resolution which was adopted of postponing the movement of British troops was mainly owing to the advanced season of the year."

flagrant and the most humiliating. *Possunt qui posse videntur*. Nothing, on the other hand, could have been more damaging to our chances of future success, than the apparent paralysis which had descended upon our arms. Confidence—and *apparent* confidence—at such a time was “half the battle.” They fail who talk of failure. Our own opinion is, that if Colonel Lawrence had been at Lahore, and Lord Hardinge at Simlah, a body of British troops would have been marched on Mooltan in the hot weather of 1848, and the empire of the Punjab would not now be a British province. It is well, at all events, that they who speak with contemptuous triumph of the failure of the Hardinge-and-Lawrence policy, should remember, that if their measures miscarried, it might have been because they were not there to work them out.

But whilst the Commander-in-Chief, in the cool mountain air of Simlah, was deciding on the impossibility of commencing military operations, a young lieutenant of the Bengal army, who had been engaged in the Revenue settlement of the country about Bunnoo, was marching down upon Mooltan with a small body of troops, to render assistance to his brother officers in their perilous position, and to support the authority of the Lahore Durbar. A letter from Mr. Agnew, addressed to Colonel Cortlandt—an European officer in the Sikh service—and intended also for his perusal, had providentially fallen into his hands. He saw at once the emergency of the case; he never hesitated; but abandoning all other considerations, got together the best force at his disposal, and, with fifteen hundred men and two pieces of artillery, marched out to create a diversion, which he hoped might rescue his countrymen from the danger that beset them.

The name of this young officer was HERBERT EDWARDES. A native of Frodley in Shropshire; the son of a country clergyman; and educated at King's College, London, he had entered the Company's service as a cadet of infantry, at an age somewhat more advanced than that which sees the initiation into military life of the majority of young officers. But at an age much earlier than that which places the majority of those officers in possession of the most superficial knowledge of the history and politics of the East, young Edwardes had acquired a stock of information, and a capacity for judging rightly of passing events, which would have done no discredit to a veteran soldier and politician. He had been very few years in the service, when his name became familiar to the reading public throughout the Presidency to which he belonged, as one of the ablest anonymous writers in the country. We might have hesitated to have spoken of this but for the public mention of the fact by one of the Go-

vernor-Generals under whom he has served, on an occasion, which, in a graceful and befitting manner, called forth an acknowledgment of Edwardes' literary talents.* Those talents, like his military qualities, were of a bold, earnest, impulsive character. Whatever he did, he did rapidly and well. He was precisely the kind of man to attract the attention and retain the favour of such an officer as Colonel Lawrence, who, with far higher and purer principles of justice and humanity, has more, perhaps, of the energy and activity, of the promptitude and readiness of Sir John Malcolm, than any officer now serving in India. Accordingly, we find in one of the earliest and most striking scenes of the Punjaabee drama, Edwardes acted a distinguished part. He was despatched to Jummoo, when the insurrection broke out in Cashmere, to awaken Golab Singh to a sense of his duty in that conjuncture; and there are few more noticeable and impressive incidents in the Sikh history of the last five eventful years, than that which exhibited a handful of scarce half a dozen British officers controlling the movements of large bodies of native troops,—the very men, and under the very leaders, who, so short a time before, had contested with us on the banks of the Sutlej the sovereignty of Hindostan.

On the reconstruction of the Sikh Government, after the deposition of Lal Singh, Lieutenant Edwardes was employed in an administrative capacity; and he had just completed the revenue-settlement of Bunnoo, when, as we have shewn, the startling intelligence of the Mooltanee outbreak reached his camp. He marched at once to succour his brother officers; crossed the Indus, and took possession of Leia, the chief city in the Sindh Sangor Doab. But tidings by this time had reached him of the melancholy fate of Agnew and Anderson. "Agnew and Anderson," he wrote to the Resident, "dead; and the Sirdar's force either traitors or prisoners in Mooltan! I have no object in advancing further. Neither could I cross the Chenab, if I wished. Neither would it be prudent to wish it, if I could. If Mooltan is to be reduced, it must be from Lahore, and by our own British troops; and I hope to God they are already on their way, or the whole of Dera Gaze Khan will be in insurrection, with hill tribes summoned by Moolraj. . . . If Moolraj has the spirit and skill to throw a force with guns over the Chenab at once, he might crush us, and return in a canter to Mooltan.

* Lord Hardinge at the last anniversary dinner of the Literary Fund, announcing a donation from Lieutenant Edwardes, spoke of him as one who wielded the pen as ably as the sword, and gracefully acknowledged the debt of gratitude owed by military commanders to the literature of their country.

Already he is said to have done so. My mind is made up. I shall throw up entrenchments here, and stand. Great ends will be secured by my success; immense confusion follow a retreat. I am entertaining men for the double purpose of securing them from joining Moolraj and holding this Doab against the rebels. . . . At present I am very much like a Scotch terrier barking at a tiger. If a week only passes, I shall have got together enough men to hold on. *If not, we are in God's hands, and could not be better placed.*"

To estimate his position aright, it must be remembered that he was 200 miles from Lahore, and some 40 from Mooltan. The fidelity of the Sikh troops under him was more than suspected. A direct appeal to them had been made in the name of the Gooroo, by the Sikhs who had deserted at Mooltan; and the emissaries of Moolraj were everywhere exerting themselves to raise the hopes of the Khalsa, and to gather all classes around the banners of the rebellious Dewan. "If I had not a Sikh soldier in my camp," he wrote, "my mind would be at ease." There was more to be dreaded from false friends than from open enemies—though a considerable force, with eight guns, was advancing to overwhelm him. Time was all that he wanted; for he was recruiting in every direction, and General Cortlandt was pushing on to reinforce him. So he wisely determined to abandon Leia,* to recross the Indus, and to avoid collision with the enemy until there were better prospects of success. The two first weeks of May were weeks of painful doubt and constant anxiety. The enemy's force had been strengthened, and was now 6000 strong, with ten pieces of artillery. Edwardes and Cortlandt together might muster about 3000 men, without the Khalsa regiment, which it was their policy to detach. Reports from time to time reached them that the enemy had crossed the river; but the insurgents seemed to waver. Their defeat at Leia had somewhat checked them; and then Dera Gazee Khan, an important post which had been held by the insurgents, fell into the hands of the Royalists after an obstinate contest. The junction of General Cortlandt's force with the troops under Lieutenant Edwardes was finally effected on the 26th May; and, now with the prestige of these successes in their favour, and with the prospect of being aided by our staunch ally, the Khan of Bahwulpore, their "ikbal" seemed on the ascendant.

Bahwulpore lies less than fifty miles to the south of Mooltan;

* A small force was left in the Fort, which conducted itself with great gallantry, beating, on the 16th of May, a detachment of rebel troops sent for its capture. The leader of the force, whom Moolraj had appointed Governor, only saved himself by hiding in a tobacco field.

and Edwardes had from the first estimated aright the advantage of a movement from that direction, and had written both to the Resident, and to the Khan himself, to urge such a demonstration. The requisition was promptly answered; and on the 30th and 31st of May, the Bahwulpore column crossed the Sutlej with more than 10,000 fighting men, principally Patans. It was intended that this force should march upon Mooltan, with the purpose of investing the place; and a British officer, Lieutenant Lake of the Engineers—a young man of good parts and considerable energy of character—was deputed to direct its movements. It was then determined by Edwardes, that as soon as he could open communications with the Bahwulpore force, he would recross the Indus, and move from the opposite direction upon Mooltan, so as to drive back the foraging armies of Moolraj, and hem him in his position. “We can then,” he wrote, “close the campaign for the hot weather, in an attitude of dignity, which will make it impossible for the most disaffected to misrepresent the delay which will ensue before the siege.”

The relative positions of the two parties were now changed. The junction having been effected between Edwardes and Cortlandt, and these officers having greatly strengthened themselves, by raising, in a short time, a considerable number of rough-and-ready hard-fighting Patans, it was their turn to talk of crossing the river, and assuming the offensive. “We are encamped here,” wrote Edwardes from Dera Gaze Khan, on the 30th of May, “threatening to cross, and the enemy opposite us looking out to prevent us.” On the 10th of June, Edwardes and his levies crossed the river. The enemy, under instructions from Mooltan, consequent upon the advance of the Bahwulpore force, had quitted their position on the opposite bank of the river, and made for Soojabad, a place to the south of Mooltan, between the Chenab and the Sutlej—an admirable move, intended to interpose a powerful body of troops in a strong position between Bahwulpore and Mooltan, and to force the Khan’s army into action before joined by Edwardes and Cortlandt. But Edwardes was too well aware of this to suffer it to take effect. He redoubled his energies, moved down in the direction of the spot where it was supposed the collision would take place, arrested the movements of the enemy, crossed the Chenab, and formed a junction with the Bahwulpore column. The enemy’s force had been greatly strengthened. Moolraj seems to have concentrated all his resources in an effort to destroy, “successively and separately,” the armies of Edwardes and of Bahawal Khan. But the officers in command of the rebel army, staggered, it would seem, by the rapid movements of Edwardes, let slip the opportunity of attacking singly the Bahwulpore column,

and on the 18th of June found himself opposed to the two forces which it was his game to have attacked separately. The junction had been accomplished during the preceding night ; and on that 18th of June,—“a day on which,” said young Edwardes, the glories of Waterloo flashing across his memory, “no Englishman could think of yielding,”—an obstinate battle was fought, and a great victory gained, of which, though but one British officer was present, the nation may well be proud.

Early morning saw the commencement of the action. Edwardes himself had scarcely crossed the river, and Cortlandt, with the guns, was still on the other side, when the enemy began their attack upon the right, where the Bahwulpore troops were posted. Directed by the smoke and firing, the young English officer, not without some hazard of finding himself in the enemy's lines, rode up to the ground—a jungly plain, which the combined forces occupied—and, passing along the entire line, exhorted them to be steady and patient under fire, and not to be drawn into a precipitate attack. He then joined his own young levies on the left of the line. All the guns were with the Bahwulpore troops ; and for some time the firing on both sides was heavy and effective. It was not until three o'clock that Edwardes was able to bring his force into action. He was without cavalry and without guns ; and the enemy, having discovered these fatal wants, turned, as the day advanced, their fire upon the Patan levies, whom with difficulty their young English commander could restrain from rushing to the attack. It was an anxious moment ; but, at the very crisis of his fate, when the enemy were within a few hundred yards of him, and he was contemplating the necessity of an unsupported attack, up came the expected and most welcome guns, with two of Cortlandt's regiments ; and Edwardes, taking command of the whole, “gave the long-wished for word to emerge from the jungle, and fall upon the rebels.”

The men whom he commanded were worthy of their leader. Young and inexperienced as they were—soldiers of a month—they “shook their swords with a will, and rushed upon the rebel cavalry with the most desperate and irresistible valour.” Edwardes himself was always in advance—always in the thick of the battle. “It was,” in his own words, “a hand-to-hand fight, and the opposing guns were pouring grape into each other almost within speaking distance. For half an hour fighting could not have been harder, and we were left entirely to ourselves.” At the end of that half-hour, a little before four o'clock, a Mussulman regiment of Cortlandt's division, headed by a Mussulman commandant, charged one of the enemy's guns in the most dashing style, and carried it at the point of the bayonet. The effect was

almost instantaneous. "Confusion fell among the artillery; ours advanced, and cruelly harassed them with grape; the infantry followed up; a momentary struggle ensued for the mastery, and the next minute the rebels were in full flight." Six of their guns fell into the hands of the victors—spirited as was the attempt to save them—with all their stores and camp equipage, and the rout was complete.

On the 22d, the united forces, mustering some 18,000 men and thirty guns, were encamped at Shoojabad. From this place Edwardes wrote to the Resident, asking for a few heavy guns, that he might reduce Mooltan; but he soon discovered that Moolraj was determined to risk one more engagement in the open plain, and to take command of the rebel force in person. On the 29th, Lieutenant Lake joined the Bahwulpore force, and for the first time since Edwardes had taken the field, he enjoyed the comfort and support of the counsels of a brother officer. On the 30th—the eve of another engagement—the allied army was strengthened by a division of Sikh troops under that very Sheikh Inaam-ood-deen who had been coerced in Cashmere. On the following morning the force marched upon Mooltan, and about mid-day the enemy advanced to give them battle. The action soon became general. On the right, Lake led the Bahwulpore troops; on the left was Edwardes, with his Patan levies, infantry and cavalry; and in the centre was Cortlandt, with two good regiments and ten guns. The enemy fought with great gallantry and determination; but, strongly posted as they were, and protected by the nature of the ground they had chosen with their usual "defensive cunning," they could not withstand the impetuous courage of the troops with their European leaders. Moolraj, who had watched the progress of the action from the back of an elephant, was fast losing confidence in the power of his soldiery, when a round shot struck the howdah in which he was seated, and threw him to the ground. It needed only such an accident as this thoroughly to dishearten the Dewan. He mounted a horse, ordered the artillery to accompany him, and fled precipitately from the field of battle. At this critical time, a gallant charge, made by one of Cortlandt's regiments, commanded by Mr. Quinn, Lieutenant Edwardes' "writer," or clerk—"a young man, but an old soldier"—put a finishing-stroke to the victory already commenced. The Mooltanee horse and foot, broken and dismayed, "fled from the hard-fought field in irrecoverable confusion." Though himself the first to retreat, Moolraj, either indignant at the flight of his infantry and cavalry, or hoping to stay their course, is said to have turned his own guns against his flying battalions. Many were shot down, many were drowned whilst attempting to cross

the nullah, which ran between the city and the field of battle; and hundreds never returned to Mooltan, "but struck out into the open country, and returned to their homes."

On the following day, the 2d of July, weakened as he was by this defeat, Moolraj again mustered his troops, and talked of another action. The Gooroos, or Priests, consulted the stars, and declared the 3d to be an auspicious day; but when it arrived, the Mooltanee soldiery were in no mood for more fighting on the plain. They spent the day burying their dead; whilst Edwardes, encamped with his own and the Bahwulpore troops at Tibbec, a few miles from Mooltan, wrote again to the Resident, urging him to take immediate measures to bring the campaign to a conclusion, by following up the advantages that had already been gained. "Heavy guns and mortars," he wrote, "sappers and miners, two European and two native regiments, a young Brigadier, and a smart engineer staff, supported by three good native regiments, and a General Cortlandt,* and my irregular hordes to scour the country round, would close Moolraj's accounts within a fortnight, and obviate the necessity of assembling 50,000 men in October."

Leaving the allied forces encamped at Tibbec, and waiting instructions from Lahore, we may now return for a brief space to the capital. Early in May, discovery was made of an attempt to corrupt the fidelity of our British sepoys. The first intimation of the plot was received from some troopers of the 7th irregular cavalry, who communicated the circumstance to their commanding officer. The principal conspirators were one Khan Singh, an unemployed General of the Sikh army, and Gunga Ram, the confidential vakeel of the Maharanee. These men, and two others, were seized, tried, and convicted. Khan Singh and Gunga Ram were publicly hanged, and their less guilty associates transported. That they were instruments of the Maharanee was sufficiently proved. The conspirators acknowledged that she was the prime instigator of the treacherous attempt, and her letters were found in their possession. With this knowledge, it could no longer be a question with the Resident as to what course it behoved him to adopt. The mother of the Maharajah and the widow of Runjeet Singh could no longer be suffered to dwell among the Sikhs. She had already been removed from Lahore to Sheikoopoor. It now became necessary to remove her from the Punjab. Accordingly, certain accredited agents of the Lahore Durbar, accompanied by two British officers, Captain Lumsden and Lieutenant Hodson, were despatched

* Thus printed in the Blue Book, page 248. It should in all probability have stood, "three good native (i.e., Sikh) regiments under General Cortlandt."

to Sheikoopoor, with a *purwannah* under the seal of the Maharajah, directing her removal from that place. Without offering any resistance, or expressing any dissatisfaction, she placed herself under the charge of the deputation; and, when it became clear to her that she was on her way to the British frontier, she desired—not improbably with that blended irony and bravado which, as we have already seen, she so well knew how to employ in her communications with the representatives of the dominant State—that her thanks might be conveyed to the Resident for removing her to the Company's dominions, out of the reach of the enemies who would destroy her. With a considerable retinue of female attendants, she was conveyed to Ferozpoore, and eventually to Benares, where she was placed under the charge of Major Macgregor, an officer of high personal character and great diplomatic experience, who had well sustained in the Punjab the brilliant reputation which he had earned at Jellalabad.

It was soon after the detection of the conspiracies that ended in the deportation of the Maharanee that some excitement was occasioned at Lahore by the proceedings in the Manjha country of a Sikh Gooroo, one Bhace Maharaj Singh, who raised the standard of revolt, and gathered around him a crowd of adherents. A regiment of irregular cavalry, with a couple of guns, was sent out against him; and the officers commanding in the neighbourhood of the scene of insurrection were directed (if occasion offered) to co-operate with the Lahore detachment. The Gooroo declared himself to be in the interest of Moolraj; and it was ascertained that an emissary of the Dewan was in his camp, supplying him with money wherewith to recruit his force. The movement was a most successful one. The Bhace crossed the Ravee, and as he went, the tide of insurrection grew stronger and stronger. Whole villages came out to greet him, recruited his ranks, and laid their supplies at his feet. By the end of May, he was little more than thirty miles from the capital, with five thousand followers. A vigorous effort was then made to destroy him. Another and stronger detachment, of all arms, including a squadron of dragoons, was sent out against him; and the Mahomedan population of the country which he was traversing successfully incited to oppose him. The British force, impeded by a severe thunderstorm, failed in their efforts to come up with the insurgents. But the rumour of their approach struck terror into the Gooroo's ranks. He beat a precipitate retreat; and ever as he went, his force melted away, until from five thousand men it had dwindled down to twelve hundred. With that diminished band of adherents, hungry and weary, the Bhace reached Jung. He could not have come upon a less

hospitable place. The chief officer of Jung was one of the few trustworthy functionaries in the service of the Sikh Government. He had promised to exert himself to destroy the insurgents, and faithfully did he fulfil his promise. He and his people fell upon the rebel force, and drove them into the Chenab, "swollen by the rains and the melted snow." Some six hundred men, horse and foot, perished in the flood. The Bhaee himself made a desperate effort to save himself, by clinging to the tail of his horse—a celebrated black mare. The brute reached the opposite bank alone. The Gooroo had found his grave in the waters.

Returning now to Mooltan, we find Edwardes encamped at Tibbee, a few miles from the city, writing again and again to the Resident for reinforcements. Before the battle of Soodoosain, he suggested that the siege of Mooltan should be commenced at once. "We are enough of us, in all conscience," he wrote, with that exhilarating confidence and naïveté so conspicuous in all his letters, "and desire nothing better than to be honoured with the commission you designed for a British army. All we require are a few heavy guns, a mortar battery, as many sappers and miners as you can spare, and Major Napier to plan our operations. That brave and able officer is, I believe, at Lahore; and the guns and mortars are doubtless, ere this, at Ferozpoore, and only require to be put into boats, and floated down to Bahwulpore. Lieutenant Lake, for whose arrival I am daily looking, is also an engineer, so we should not want science; and every other material is at hand for bringing to a rapid and honourable conclusion the rebellion of Mooltan." But this appeal was of no avail. The Resident wrote, that he could not send guns without sending artillerymen, and that such an intermixture of British soldiers would compromise the British Government. The battle of Soodoosain was fought; and Edwardes wrote, as we have seen, to the Resident for a British brigade. And this time he did not write in vain. Sir F. Currie took upon himself the responsibility of ordering a strong body of British troops, under General Whish, commandant of the Lahore division, and an old and experienced artillery officer, to hold itself in readiness to march with a powerful siege-train upon Mooltan. The Commander-in-Chief shook his head—the Governor-General shook his head. Neither authority favoured the movement. But the Resident had ordered it on his own responsibility, and the work commenced must therefore proceed. It would not do to encourage a belief that there was any want of unanimity in British counsels.

So the British force was duly equipped—the siege-train prepared—and before the end of July everything was in readiness for the commencement of the march. In the meanwhile, Mooltan

was recovering from the effects of the disasters which had befallen him in his engagements with Edwardes, recruiting his shattered force, talking of action, but suffering it to evaporate in talk. "Moolraj himself," wrote Lieutenant Edwardes, in his most animated style, "is at his wit's end; sometimes he talks of a night attack, and sits up all night in a Hindu temple near the bridge, cased in chain armour from head to foot, like Don Quixote watching for his knighthood in the cathedral aisle. But nothing comes of it. Another time, he talks of cutting the canal, but is restrained from doing so by fear of destroying the fort-ditch. One day he fortifies the city, and the next day he fortifies the fort. To-day he tells all his soldiers to leave him because he has got no money to pay them; and to-morrow keeps up their spirits by assuring them that when iron shot fails he will fire silver upon the besiegers." The Durbar force, under Rajah Shere Singh, had joined Lieutenant Edwardes before Mooltan; and it was then the opinion of that officer, as of the Resident, that the Sirdars were heart and soul on our side; that is, as the former significantly explained himself, "on the side of Jagheers, titles, employments, and whole throats," but that the soldiery were to a man against us. The intelligence of the intended despatch of the British force to Mooltan, arrived most opportunely. It came upon Shere Singh's camp, in the language of another chief, "like water upon fire."* The Rajah himself had some inducements to loyalty. His sister was betrothed to the Marajah; and both he and his father Chuttur Singh, who governed in the Hazareh country, an infirm old man, who talked of ending his days with a pilgrimage, were eager to press on the marriage. But they, who knew best the state of feeling throughout the country, felt that there was great danger in the proximity of Shere Singh's regiments to Edwardes' loyal battalions, and dreaded lest any collision should take place with the insurgents, to call into active force the slumbering treachery of the Khalsa army.

In truth, there was much cause for anxiety. It was evident that the entire country was in a most unsettled and feverish condition. That there was a net-work of rebellious intrigue stretched over the entire surface of the Punjab, we never believed; and now that ample official revelations have been made, we can find no evidence of it. Under the fostering influence of continued immunity, rebellion became contagious. The success of Moolraj had emboldened others; and the memory of Sobraon was waxing dim in the minds of the Khalsa. In whatsoever

* "The expression," wrote Edwardes, "is so good, that as you read you will, I am sure, fancy that you hear mutiny hissing at being extinguished, and dying away into smoke with sputtering curses at the ever-victorious Feringhee."

direction the Resident turned his eyes, there were signs of unrest and disaffection. From the Hazareh Captain Abbott sent gloomy accounts. It was the belief of this officer that Chuttur Singh was at the head of a deeply-laid conspiracy for the expulsion of the British from the Punjab. This was discredited at Lahore, and Captain Abbott's convictions attributed to the imaginative cast of his mind; but it was obvious that the Sikh soldiery in the Hazareh were ripe for any sort of mischief—only waiting the opportunity to break out into open revolt. The emissaries of Moolraj had been actively employed in all directions, intriguing, indeed, up to the very gates of Cabool; and it could not be doubted, for a moment, that wherever any large body of Sikh troops were posted, there it became necessary that the extreme vigilance should be exercised by the British officers in political charge of the neighbouring country. The Hazareh field-force had become an especial object of apprehension. It had come into collision with the Mahomedan population of the place: it had been suspected of a design to march upon Lahore; it had subsequently risen against an American officer, Colonel Canora,* who had refused to obey certain orders which he believed would be disapproved by Captain Abbott, and before the end of August, was in open rebellion under Chuttur Singh, and in full march upon Attock.

A detailed account of all the transactions in the Hazareh country would be a history in itself, and one full of romantic interest. The political officers wrote for a British brigade to coerce the mutinous Sikh troops; but this was determinedly denied them. Captain Abbott had begun to raise levies of his own; but sceptical of the emergency said to have arisen, the Resident censured the proceeding. But it was not long before the conduct of Chuttur Singh stood forth in so unquestionable a light as to be clearly intelligible at Lahore and Calcutta. Sir Frederick Currie believed that the Sirdar would be willing to make terms, and to come in to Lahore. He gave him every opportunity of submitting gracefully; but the chief had made

* The conduct of this man deserves something more than such an incidental notice as this. "He stood alone," wrote Captain Abbott, "against the whole Sikh army; and when his dastardly golundauze (artillerymen) refused to fire, he took the match into his own hand. After his fall, and before he expired, he is said to have killed two Sikh officers with his double-barrelled pistol." In another letter, Captain Abbott says, "Canora loaded his two guns with grape, and ordered the golundauze to fire; but they replied that they were the Sirdar's servants. On his havildar also refusing, he cut him down, and, seizing the match, applied it to the next. The gun burnt priming; and at that instant two men, one a Sepoy of Ruk-paul Singh's corps, shot him through the thorax. Before he died, he attempted to cut down another man, but was himself cut down by a third Sepoy who was behind him, dying as gallant a death as I have ever heard recorded."

his election, and was by no means disposed to recede. "The reports current," wrote Major Lawrence, the political agent at Peshawur—a brother of Colonel (Sir Henry) Lawrence, and an officer whose name and adventures are familiar to all who have perused the stirring annals of the war and captivity in Afghanistan—"are, that Chuttur Singh has given out that he has devoted his head to his God, and will stand or fall in the cause he has espoused." The Hazareh force was at this time close upon Attock, into which place Captain Nicholson had thrown himself with such troops as he could muster, with some Afghan reinforcements from Peshawur, and two or three months' provisions, "burning and ravaging all the villages known to have rendered Captain Nicholson assistance, and with shouts proclaiming the return of their Gooroojee's rule." Lieutenant Herbert joined the garrison on the 1st of September, and Captain Nicholson moved out to watch the movements of the insurgents.

In the meanwhile, the force under General Whish had reached Mooltan in high health and spirits, and was about to commence operations for the reduction of the place. On the 4th of September the siege-train arrived. On the 5th, in the name of the Maharajah and Queen Victoria, the British General summoned the town and garrison to surrender. No answer to this appeal having been returned, a counsel of war was held on the following day, and the engineer-officers submitted their plans of attack. After some discussion, a proposal offered by Lieutenant Lake was finally accepted. The basis of operations was laid down, and on the morning of the 7th, the first parallel was commenced. There had been some talk of carrying the city by a coup-de-main; but the plan was abandoned as hazardous, and regular siege operations were entered upon—Europeans and natives working vigorously in the trenches. We cannot attempt to record all the minor incidents of the siege. On the 9th, the chief engineer intimated to the General his opinion, that the force was unequal to the reduction of Mooltan; but General Whish, who with the true *esprit* of an old artillery officer, had great confidence in his guns, dissented from Major Napier, and proceeded with the work more hopefully than those by whom he was surrounded. On the 12th, it became necessary to carry by assault an outwork of considerable strength, which was obstinately defended by the enemy; and in this affair fell Colonel Pattoun of Her Majesty's 32d, Major Montizambert of Her Majesty's 10th, with three other officers killed, and twelve wounded. After a hard hand-to-hand conflict, the enemy were beaten back with considerable loss. The casualties on our side were numerous—but the advantage gained was worth the sacrifice. "It placed all the defensible points on this side the city

in our hands, and enabled the battering guns to be advanced to within six hundred yards of the wall—a position they could not have attained by regular approaches in less than a week.”* On the 14th another outwork was carried; but on that day, when our guns were within breaching distance of the walls of the town, General Whish, to his extreme mortification, was compelled to abandon the siege. The Sikh force under Shere Singh had gone over to the enemy.

This event had long been matter of anxious speculation in the British camp, and took no one by surprise. It was known that the hearts of the soldiery were with Moolraj; but there was something of a more doubtful character in the conduct of the Rajah himself, who had on more than one occasion testified his zeal and loyalty by voluntary acts of service in our cause. On the 1st of September, he had assisted Lieutenant Edwardes, who had been attacked when changing his ground by a party of light troops from Mooltan, by getting his guns into position, and enfilading the enemy; and on the 3d, he had again cannonaded the troops of the Dewan—thinking, as he said, it would be “a good thing to get a few men killed on both sides, so as to destroy the good understanding between his own Sikhs and those in the garrison.” In his own camp, the Khalsa troops said contemptuously, that he was a Mussulman, and in Mooltan, they had given him the nick-name of “Rajah *Sheikh* Singh.” With Lieutenant Edwardes he was on the best possible terms; spoke freely of the conduct of his father, Chuttur Singh, declared that he washed his hands of all the old man’s rebellious projects; and candidly avowed his mistrust of the Sikh troops. At last, after contemplating with his wonted intrepidity, a movement to surprise, surround and disarm the suspected regiments, the idea of which he only abandoned when he considered that, posted as they were, it would be impossible to turn their flank—Edwardes summoned the Sirdars to his tent, and exhorted them to withdraw their divisions from the proximity of the British camp, and eventually to return to Lahore. After much discussion, it was agreed that two of the divisions should be withdrawn, on different pretexts, and that the third, which consisted principally of Mussulmans, should “take up a position to cover and protect the ferry.”

* “Annals of India for the year 1848,” by George Buist, LL.D., F.R.S., &c.—a work which reached us from India, after the greater part of this Article was in type, or it would have been more frequently referred to, and more prominently quoted. It is a very valuable and able compilation, from the Indian journals—highly creditable not only to the compiler, but to the Indian press, the copiousness and accuracy of whose intelligence it fairly reflects. Written before the appearance of the Parliamentary Blue Book now before us, there is yet very little which that bulky volume of State Papers enables us to correct.

The morning of the 14th was fixed for the march—but on that morning, the whole Sikh force moved bodily off to Mooltan. Doubtful of the real nature of the movement, the Dewan at first refused them admittance; but satisfied of their intentions, he soon opened his gates; the long dreaded and fatal junction was effected; and the British General was under the mortifying necessity of raising the siege of Mooltan.*

We now come upon a new act of this eventful drama. Up to this time, we have seen the Lahore Government, assisted by British troops, endeavouring to coerce a refractory subject. We must now cease to regard the matter in that light. It would be the veriest sham—a culpable falsification of history, to adhere any longer to such a nomenclature. The Durbar chiefs were in open hostility to the British—raising the standard of nationality in the name of the Maharajah. Chuttur Singh was the father-in-law—Shere Singh the brother-in-law—of the young sovereign. It was obvious that the war now about to be waged, was between the British and the Sikhs. Every week seemed to demonstrate more incontestably than the last, that nothing was left for the British Government but to fight it out single-handed. Some hope was at one time derivable from the fact of long-standing feuds among the different Sikh families. Then there was the not unreasonable conviction, that the Mahomedan population of the Punjab might easily be kept in a state of enmity with the Sikhs. But these assurances soon melted away. Hostile families and hostile religions were content to unite for the nonce against the Feringhees; and the Commander-in-Chief, as the cold weather approached, was gratified by finding that there had been no premature birth of victory—that the work was yet to be done—and that an army of 20,000 men, under his personal command, was required to take the field.

Matters were growing worse in the Hazareh country; and in

* The conduct of Shere Singh was long an enigma to the political officers, and is still somewhat inexplicable. It was surmised that he, as some other Sirdars unquestionably were, was forcibly carried off by the troops. But this was sufficiently disproved by the discovery of a letter from Shere Singh to his brother, Goolab Singh at Lahore, (the reader inexperienced in Sikh individualities must not confound this person with the Maharajah of Cashmere,) stating his deliberate intention of going over to the insurgents on the 14th of September, and recommending his brother to join their father's party in the Hazareh. The fact appears to be, that the Rajah was for some time undecided; and that when he had made up his mind to revolt, it was his wish to join, with all his followers, the Hazareh movement; but that, knowing where there was most treasure, the soldiery demurred to this proposal, and set their faces towards Mooltan. It appears certain that Moolraj did not anticipate the movement; and we greatly doubt whether all the evidences of his fidelity, which were put forth at an earlier period, were speciously contrived to throw dust into the eyes of the British Officers, who were anxiously watching his proceedings.

Bunnoo the Sikh troops had murdered their officers, and were aiding the Hazareh movement. The thoughts of Shere Singh soon began to turn again towards that quarter, and before the second week of October had passed away he had marched out of Mooltan. Reinforcements were ordered up from Bombay to assist General Whish; but the army of the Commander-in-Chief was now fast collecting, and the main action of the drama was for a time diverted from Mooltan, where for a long and wearisome season, the army continued in a state of enforced inactivity. "The Sikhs generally," wrote the Resident to Lord Gough on the 18th of October, "have ceased to consider Mooltan as the place where the battle for their faith is to be fought; and with the fickleness and faithlessness peculiar to their character, are now apparently abandoning Dewan Moolraj without scruple to his own resources. * * * Unless the accounts received by the last four dawks are much exaggerated, the greater part of his Sikh followers had left him to join, as they say, the national standard, under which a vital struggle is to be made for the restoration of Khalsa supremacy in the Punjab."

The month of October was one of busy preparation upon all sides. The Governor-General was moving up to the north-western frontier.* On that frontier an overwhelming army was assembling for the conquest of the Punjab. There were three Sikh forces in arms against us, headed by men in whom the especial trust of the British had once been fondly reposed; and there was scarcely, throughout the country, a single chief upon whose aid, in an hour of danger and temptation, the Resident could venture to rely. The Maharajah was at the capital—a child and a puppet—whose name was used alike in the manifestos of the British Government and the Sikh leaders. Virtually a prisoner in the hands of the former, the latter were eager to possess themselves of his person; and but for the vigilance of Sir Frederick Currie, would have achieved an object which would have added a new element of strength to their cause. In whichever direction the Resident turned his eyes, there was open hostility to be encountered, or secret treachery to be thwarted and crushed. Shere Singh was moving about the plains, ravaging the country as he went. Chuttur Singh, now an open undisguised foe, was in the hill-districts of Hazareh, about to form a junction with his son; and Moolraj was still snort-

* He left Calcutta on the 11th, leaving the Government of Bengal in the hands of Sir Herbert Maddock. On the 5th he is reported to have said, in a speech delivered at an entertainment at Barrackpore,—“I have wished for peace; I have longed for it; I have striven for it: but if the enemies of India determine to have war, war they shall have—and on my word, Sirs, they shall have it with a vengeance.”

ing defiance at the British from behind the walls of Mooltan. Attock was invested by Sikh troops; but with a strong Afghan garrison, Herbert gallantly held his own. Abbott, too, held out at Dhara; but Peshawur had revolted: first the Sikhs, and then the Mussulmans, had mutinied and attacked the Residency; and Chuttur Singh, joined by the Barukzye Sirdars, became masters of the place.*

The British army, destined for the re-conquest of the Punjab, assembled at Ferozpoore, and crossed the river in different detachments at different times. The head-quarters marched into Lahore on the 13th of November, and on the 16th crossed the river in advance. On the 21st, Lord Gough joined the army on the banks of the Chenab. The force then under his immediate command consisted of upwards of 20,000 men, with nearly 100 pieces of artillery. On the 22d was fought the battle of Ramnuggur, the first of those disastrous successes which have given so gloomy a character to the campaign. The enemy had a strong masked battery on the other side of the river, and very cleverly contrived to draw the British troops into an ambuscade. The operations of the Commander-in-Chief, commenced with the object of driving a party of the rebels, who were on his side of the Chenab, across the river, had the effect of bringing his cavalry and artillery within reach of these concealed guns; and twenty-eight pieces of ordnance opened upon our advancing columns. The brilliant charges of the cavalry were attended with the result which, under such circumstances, might be expected. They were ordered to advance to the attack as soon as an opportunity presented itself. They found an opportunity, and charged a large body of the enemy—the Sikh batteries pouring in their deadly showers all the while. Many fell under the fire of the guns, many under the sabre cuts of the Sikhi swordsmen, many under the withering fire of a body of matchlockmen, who, taking advantage of the nature of the ground, harassed our horsemen sorely. Nothing was gained by our “victory;” but we lost many brave soldiers—among them two of the finest cavalry officers in India, Colonel Cureton and Colonel Havelock; and our troops returned to camp weary and dispirited, asking what end they had accomplished, and sighing over the cost.

Some days afterwards a force under General Thackwell was sent out to cross the river, but being scantily supplied with information, and grievously hampered by instructions, it succeeded

* Major Lawrence, compelled to retreat, threw himself upon the hospitality of Sultan Mahomed Khan, who treacherously gave him up, with Lieutenant Bowie, to Chuttur Singh, into whose hands also Mrs. Lawrence had fallen. They appear to have been well treated by that Sirdar.

only in losing a few men and killing several of the enemy. No great object was gained, but great opportunities were sacrificed. The Commander-in-Chief pompously declared that "it had pleased Almighty God to vouchsafe to the British arms the most successful issue to the extensive combinations rendered necessary for the purpose of effecting the passage of the Chenab, the defeat and dispersion of the Sikh force under the insurgent Rajah Shere Singh and the numerous Sikh Sirdars who had the temerity to set at defiance the British power." These "events, so fraught with importance," were to "tend to most momentous results." The results were, that the field of battle was shifted from the banks of the Chenab to the banks of the Jhelum. The enemy, who might have been taken in rear, and whose guns might have been seized, if Thackwell had been free to carry out the most obvious tactics, escaped with all their guns; and on the 13th of January bore bloody witness to the little they had suffered, by fighting one of the greatest and most sanguinary battles in which either the Sikh or the British power in India had ever been engaged.

We can give but a scanty outline of these events; and the details are perhaps too fresh in the memory of our readers to render it necessary that we should do more. On the 13th of January, an hour or two after noon, Lord Gough found himself within a few miles of the enemy's position, near the village of Chillianwallah, with one of the finest forces under his command that had ever been assembled in India. Colonel Lawrence, who during his brief sojourn in England, had been created a Knight Commander of the Bath, had arrived a day or two before in camp;* and Major Mackeson was there also, in the official position of political agent with the grand army. The time had now obviously arrived for Lord Gough to strike a blow at the enemy. It was his game to ascertain correctly the position of the Sikh hosts; and then with the whole day before him, to attack them deliberately and strategically on the following morning. This, the Commander-in-Chief, to whom in such conjunc-

* He was then in no recognised official position, the term of Sir F. Currie's tenure of office not expiring before the beginning of February. Sir Henry Lawrence left England at the end of October, and reached Bombay on the 8th of December. "Pushing up the Indus with his accustomed celerity of movement," says Dr. Buist, "he joined General Whish on the 27th, and remained at Mooltan till the capture of the city on the 2d January. He then hastened upwards to Ferozpoor, which he reached on the 6th, and was the first to convey to the Governor-General at Mukkoo on the same evening the tidings of our first success. After a few hours' stay with Lord Dalhousie, he, arranging the measures to be next pursued, pushed on to Lahore, where he arrived on the morning of the 9th, and attended the Durbar. From this he the same evening started for the camp of the Commander-in-Chief, which he reached the next night."

tures as this, the delay of a few hours was always irksome, had consented to do ; but it was decreed otherwise. Some shot from the enemy's advanced guns having fallen near his camp, all his good resolves were shaken. His Irish blood could "stand it no longer;" and with characteristic impetuosity he flung himself upon the enemy's position. We shrink from the description of what followed. "The action," said the Commander-in-Chief, "was characterized by peculiar features." These peculiar features we have no desire to pourtray. Night closed upon the fearful carnage of that terrible engagement, and both armies claimed the victory. What it cost us the Gazette has informed the country. Never was Gazette received in England with such a storm of indignation. The past services—the intrepid personal courage—the open, honest character—the many noble qualities of the veteran commander, were forgotten in that burst of popular indignation ; and hundreds of English families turned from the angry past to the fearful future, and trembled as they thought that the crowning action with the formidable enemy had yet to be fought by a General so rash, so-headstrong, and so incompetent.

But we had seen the worst of that sanguinary campaign. Already was the tide beginning to turn in favour of the Feringhees. On the 2d of January, the city of Mooltan was carried by General Whish. Long and obstinate had been the defence ; gallant the resistance of the besieged ; and now that our storming columns entered the breach, the garrison still, at the bayonet's point, showed the stuff of which they were made. Frightful had been the carnage during the siege. Heaps of mangled bodies about the battered town bore ghastly witness to the terrible effects of the British ordnance. But many yet stood to be shot down or bayoneted in the streets ; and the work of the besieging force was yet far from its close. Moolraj was in the citadel with some thousands of his best fighting-men ; and the fort guns were plied as vigorously as before the capture of the town. The strength of this formidable fortress seemed to laugh our breaching batteries to scorn. Mining operations were, therefore, commenced ; but carried on, as they were, beneath a constant discharge from our mortar batteries, it seemed little likely that the enemy would wait to test the skill of the engineers. The terrible shelling to which the fortress was exposed dismayed the pent-up garrison. By the 21st of January they were reduced to the last extremity. Moolraj vainly endeavoured to rally his followers. Their spirit was broken. There was nothing left for them but to make a desperate sally and cut their way through the besiegers, or to surrender at once. The latter course was determined upon. Asking only for his own life and

the honour of his women, Moolraj tendered on that day his submission to General Whish. The General refused to guarantee the first, but promised to protect the women; and on the following morning the garrison marched out of Mooltan, and Dewan Moolraj threw himself upon the mercy of the British Government.

Anxiously was intelligence of the surrender of Moolraj looked for in the camp of the Commander-in-Chief. Since that disastrous action at Chillianwallah, Lord Gough had been entrenching his position, and waiting re-enforcements from Mooltan. The surrender of that fortress set free some 12,000 men; and General Whish, with unlooked for rapidity, marched to the banks of the Jhelum to swell the ranks of the grand army. A great crisis was now approaching. Twice had the British and Sikh forces met each other on the banks of those classical rivers which had seen the triumphs of the Macedonian—twice had they met each other only to leave the issue of the contest yet undecided. A great battle was now about to be fought—one different from all that had yet been fought since the Sikhs first crossed the Sutlej; for a strange and unlooked for spectacle was about to present itself—Sikhs and Afghans, those old hereditary enemies, fighting side by side against a common foe. The Sikh Sirdars had long been intriguing to secure the assistance of the Ameer of Cabool. For some time there appeared little likelihood of the old Dost, whose experience ought to have brought wisdom with it, lending himself to a cause which, in spite of temporary successes, was so sure to prove hopeless in the end. But neither years, nor experience, nor adversity, had taught him to profit by the lessons he had learned. The desire of repossessing himself of Peshawur was the madness of a life. The bait was thrown out to him, and he could not resist it. He came through the Khybur with an Afghan force; marched upon the Indus, and threatened Attock, which fell at his approach;* despatched one of his sons to the camp of Shere Singh; and sent a body of Douranee troops to fight against his old Feringhee enemy, who for years had been the arbiter of his fate. How deplorable an act of senile fatuity it was, the events of the 21st of February must have deeply impressed upon his mind. On that day was fought an action—was gained a victory, “memorable alike from the greatness of the occasion,” to use the emphatic words of the Governor-General, “and from the brilliant and decisive issue of the encounter. For the first time, Sikh and Afghan were banded together

* On the 8d of January, up to which time it had been gallantly defended by Lieutenant Herbert. The infidelity of the garrison alone compelled him to desert his post.

against the British power. It was an occasion which demanded the putting forth of all the means at our disposal, and so conspicuous a manifestation of the superiority of our arms as should appal each enemy, and dissolve at once their compact by fatal proof of its futility. The completeness of the victory which has been won, equals the highest hopes entertained." And there was no diplomatic exaggeration in this—none of the vain boasting of the interested despatch-writer. At Goojrat, to which place the enemy had unexpectedly moved their camp, Lord Gough fought a great battle as a great battle ought to be fought, coolly and deliberately, by a British Commander. Every arm of his fine force was brought effectively into play—each in its proper place, each supporting and assisting the others, and each covering itself with glory. At early morning the cannonade commenced. By noon the enemy were retreating in terrible disorder—"their position carried—their guns, ammunition, camp equipage, and baggage captured—their flying masses driven before their victorious pursuers, from mid-day receiving most severe punishment in their flight." And all this was accomplished with but little loss of life on the side of the victorious army. It pleased the Almighty that the bloody lessons of the Chenab and the Jhelum should not be thrown away.

A division under Sir Walter Gilbert—an officer of great personal activity and energy of character—was ordered to follow up the success of Goojrat, and to drive the Afghans from the Punjab. And well did he justify the choice of his chief. By a series of rapid marches, scarcely excelled by any recorded in history, he convinced the enemy of the hopelessness of all further resistance; and Sher Singh and his associates determined on trusting themselves to the clemency of the British Government. On the 5th of March, the Rajah sent the British prisoners safely into Gilbert's camp. On the 8th, he appeared himself, to make arrangements for the surrender of his followers; and on the 14th, the remnant of the Sikh army, some sixteen thousand men, including thirteen Sirdars of note, laid down their arms at the feet of the British General.

The Barukzye force fled before our advancing columns, and secured the passage of the Khybur before British influence could avail to close it against the Afghans. Attock and Peshawur were reoccupied by our troops, and the second Sikh war was at an end. On the 29th of March, the Governor-General of India issued a proclamation, annexing the territories of the Maharajah of Lahore to the British empire in India. So fell the sovereignty of the Sikhs in the country of the five rivers. Justly forfeited by the treachery of its own chiefs, the Punjab became a province under the rule of that Government by whose cle-

mency and moderation the Khalsa had been left in a position to defy again its old opponents, and again to abide the issue of the conflict. Conquered a second time—they were not spared a second time—they were not left again to renew the struggle, and to provoke a third sanguinary war. In a masterly State Paper, Lord Dalhousie has placed on record the grounds on which he based his determination to annex the Punjab to the British dominions. No acquisition of territory has ever been more honourably gained. We set no store by the acquisition;—we believe that, having gained the Punjab, the Government of India is poorer than before. But, contemplating the events which we have narrated, we are profoundly convinced that there was no other course left to the Governor-General—that the annexation of the Punjab was a *necessary* measure;—and, with abundant faith in the divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we may, our vision of the future is not darkened by the shadow of a fear that it will prove to be a calamitous one.

INDEX

INDEX

TO THE

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

A

Animals and plants, importance of correct histories of, 95.

B

Babylon, ruins of, 211.

Biblical literature, non-professional students of, sign of the times, 189.

Bonaparte family—origin of their attachment to France, 156—their sudden and extreme transitions—their condition in Corsica, 159—during the Reign of Terror, 160—under the Directory, Napoleon appointed First Consul, 161—family under the Consulate, 162—accession of Napoleon to the imperial dignity, 163—family under the empire—Napoleon's approach to universal empire, 166—divorces the Empress Josephine, and marries Archduchess Maria Louisa, 167—the birth of his son—his disastrous invasion of Russia—abdicates—an exile in Elba—appears again in France—is defeated at Waterloo—finally exiled to St. Helena, 167—surviving members of the family, 168—Maria Louisa and her son, 169—young Napoleon—his passionate fondness for his father's memory, 171—he broods on the past, and is in restless anxiety about the future, 172—exhibits early symptoms of disease, 174—dispersion of the family, 175—Joseph and Jerome, 175—Eugene Beauharnais, and Lucien, 177—family of Lucien, 179—mother of the Bonapartes, 179—Louis and his sons, 178—Louis attempts a revolution at Strasbourg, 182—makes a similar attempt at Boulogne, 184—receives sentence of perpetual banishment, 185—restoration, 186.

Botta, M. commences excavations in the great mound of Koyunjik, 215—is en-

couraged by the Academy of Inscription and Belles Lettres in Paris, 216.

Buchanan's, Dr., Ten Years' Conflict—character of the work, 453.

Butler and Morell compared, 331.

C

Canning, Sir Stratford, procures authority to excavate and remove the sculptures from the ruins of Nineveh, 225—presents them to the British nation, and obtains a grant to the British Museum for carrying on the researches, 236.

Church of England, abuse of Patronage in, 189—Biblical learning not patronized by, 191.

Christianity, essence of, by Mr. Morell, 15. Class-selfishness opposed to national prosperity, 275.

Conway tubular bridge, 605.

D

Dead Sea, Narrative of an Expedition to, by John Pasty, 494—See Jordan.

Devil-worshippers, periodical feast of, 230—night scene of, 233—tenets, 235.

Disruption, fame of the act of, 451.

E

Edwardes, Herbert, his generous behaviour in the Mooltan war, 641—an able author, 642—employed in an administrative capacity, 642—his prudent and magnanimous conduct, 643.

F

Faith and Unbelief, battle between, 388.

G

German Socialism—the differences among Socialists—agree in the crusade against property, 406—relation of theory to prac-

tice, 407—internal controversies of Socialism, 409—contempt of the Humanist for dilettante Socialism, 411—pedantry of system-mongers, 413—the necessity of the emancipation of woman, 414.—Fichte's organization of labour, 415—the triumph of democracy leads to the abuse of power, 415—thoroughgoing Socialists would establish social despotism, 416—the orthodox Socialist—Socialism in Belgium, 418.—St Simon and Pierre Leroux, 420.—Fourier and his Fancies, 422.—Considerant's political indifferentism, 425—demonstrable absurdities of Socialism, 426.—Learian despotism, 427.—Atheistic communism, 427—property theft, 428—economic difficulties of Socialism, 429.—Feuerbach's humanism, 431.—Grün approves less or more of all the schools, 432—the last word of Socialism, 433—socialist theories the bar to Constitutional Governments on the Continent, 433—present tendency of socialist politics, 434—democratic agitation resolved into Socialism, 435.

Gioberti, Vincent, his name invested with peculiar interest, 369—his birthplace, early preferment, and exile, 369—obtained extensive celebrity, 370,—a graphic picture contained in announcements in the journals of the day, 371—his character as a patriot and a friend of liberty, 375—opposition to the Jesuits—monarchical tendencies, 377—a zealous Roman Catholic, 378—the Papacy incompatible with liberty, 379—his catholicism, 381—vision of a universal monarchy, 383—his policy regarding the Pope's restoration, 384—his earlier writings, 385—character of his chief work, 387—his power of portraiture, 388—progress of philosophical speculation, 388—European conflict, 389—Descartes and Luther, 391—state of philosophy in Europe, 392—inconsistency in Gioberti's mode of explaining, 393—position assigned to Dr. Thomas Reid, 395—his theory an expansion of Malebranche's Ideal Vision, 396—its opposition to views generally entertained, 399—Gioberti's testimony to the positive truths of Christianity, 402—the strength of his system, 405.

H

House of Commons, last Report of Select Committee on Slave Trade Policy, 474.
Human Mind, faculties of, by Morell, 3.

Jordan and the Dead Sea, Narrative of the United States' Expedition to, by W. F. Lynch, 494—nothing left to wonder at, 494—sense of wonder tamed down, 497—the Dead Sea no exception, 497—encouragement of art and science by the United States and the British Governments, 498

—accounts of the expedition, 499—origin of the expedition, 501—feelings at starting, 503—difficulties, 504—boats on the Lake of Galilee, 505—the officers make a division of labour, 505—levels of the Lake of Tiberias and the Dead Sea, 506—the boats on the water, 507—changing aspects of the river, 507—passage of the rapids, 508—description of part of the river's course, 509—character of the neighbouring Arabs, 510—importance of the river exploration, 511—want of generalization in the account, 512—result of the Dead Sea exploration—excursion to Kerak—Christians at, 514—exploration of Upper Jordan, 515—loss sustained by the death of Lieutenant Dale, 517—remarks upon the Dead Sea smoke—fruits, 518—pillar of salt, 519—density of the waters, 522—sensations produced by application of the water to the skin, 524—aspects of the lake, 525—non-existence of living things in the water, 525—vegetation, birds, 526.

L

Lawrence, Colonel, high character as a military officer, 642.
Layard, A. H. L., Esq., history of, 249.
Layard's Nineveh and its Remains, 209. See Nineveh.
Layman, success of, in religious writing, 183.
Local histories, value of, 95.
London and Dublin, communication between, 605.

M

McCulloch, Mr., statement regarding cheapness of slave-labour, 471.
Malebranche's idea of creation, 396.
Menai Straits, tubular bridge over, 607.

N

National education, Ragged Schools embraced in the scheme of, 89.
Nestorian Christians visited by Mr. Layard, 226—10,000 of them massacred, and numbers carried off as slaves, 226—second massacre, 229—their history, 230.
Nineveh, metropolis of the Assyrian empire, built by Shem, a populous city having many strongholds—destroyed in the year 605, B.C., prophecies confirmed by profane historians and modern travellers, 209—notice of its ruins, 212—the area examined, 213—excavations by M. Botta, who transmits copies of inscriptions and sculptures to Paris, 216—Mr. Layard commences excavations at Nimroud, 217—encouraged by Sir Stratford Canning, 217—conduct of the Pasha, and consequent difficulties, 218—valuable discoveries, 219—rejoicings and musing over these, 222—authority to excavate and to remove the sculptures procured by Sir

S. Canning, 235—Mr. Layard's health fails—visits the Tyari mountains, where he is hospitably entertained by the Nestorian or Chaldaean Christians, 226, and visits the scene of a horrible massacre, 226—is invited to the periodical feast of the "worshippers of the devil," 230—Mr. Layard returns to Mosul—a grant obtained to the British Museum for carrying on the researches—success of the operations, 236—twenty-eight chambers discovered, 237—scene at the transportation of the principal sculptures, 241—description of the principal edifice, 243—Jonah's tomb, 244—Mr. Layard, having completed his labours, returns to England, 245—history of the ancient Assyrians, 246—chronological conclusions, 247.

Noteworthy Novels—use of works of imagination, 475—glance at the characters, 476—defects, 477—beauties, 479—Mr. Danby and Susan, 481—theory of wooing, 483—Jane the complement of Rochester, 485—"Wuthering Heights" and "The Tenant of Wildfellhall," 487—Fanny's story, 489—influence of novel reading, 493.

Novel reading, influence of, 493.

Osprey, 105—nest, 107.

P

Philosophy, state of, in Europe, 392.

Philosophy of Religion, by Mr. Morell, 1—faculties of the human mind, 3—peculiar essence of religion, 9—essence of Christianity, 15—idea of revelation, 19—analogies of revelation and intuition, 21—revelation not the mission of divine teachers, 23—revelation God speaking to man, 25—not merely a subjective influence, 31—an objective discovery of truth, 33—not primarily intuitional—use of reason in dealing with, 39—inspiration, 293—Christian theology, 305—nature of theology, 307—the intuitional and the logical, 309—two different kinds of revelation, 311—reconciliation must precede renewal, 313—an explicit announcement of the Gospel the foundation of spiritual experience, 314—appeal to Scripture and the Reformation, 315—method of Christian theology, 317—the theologian and his theology, 319—difference between the student's preparation and the method of study, 319—progressiveness of theology, 320—similarity between Mr. Newman's sentiments and Mr. Morell's—his theory of Christianity in its origin and progress, 323—leads for peace to refugees of lica, 324—issues—exposition of religion, natural and revealed—account of the facts and phenomena of conscience demanded—evidence of testimony, 326—credibility and significance of miracles, 327—existence of a Divine

Revelation, 327—construction of a theology, 329—want of discussion of the nature of man as a fallen being, and a deliverance on the nature of the Christian scheme, 330—Butler and Morell compared, 331—statement of the question, 333—vague and wordy pomp of phraseology, 334—Christian union, 335.

Physical geography, importance of, 95.

Poetry, 46.

Polish history, 550.

Pope, the temporal sovereignty of—history of the Papacy interesting to the historian and the philosopher, 254—the leading positions of Protestants and of Papists, 255—impartial investigation by Protestants of the historical aspect of the subjects of difference, 256—objects of the Abbé Gosselin and of recent Romish writers upon the continent, 257—the power of the Pope, 257—mode of conciliating favour towards the temporal sovereignty, 258—decree of the Roman Republic—Pope's protestation, 259—origin and foundation of the temporal sovereignty of, 260—donation of Constantine—admitted to be a forgery, 262—Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, 262—does not rest on any *jus Divinum*—object of this position, 264—practice and policy of the Popes and the older Romish writers in regard to *jus Divinum*, 265, did not originate in the ambition and intrigues of the Popes, 266—legitimacy of, 267—objection to, 268—rights of the people of Rome, 269—abolition of, 270—dangers from loss of, 271—prospects of restoration—opinions of Bossuet and of Napoleon, 273.

Popery incompatible with liberty, 379.

Popular ignorance, injurious effects of, 375.

R

Ragged Schools—John Pounds the founder of, 71—Sheriff Watson's exertions in behalf of—in Aberdeen, 73—results of, 78—preventive of crime, 83—effects on pauperism—embraced in the scheme of national education, 83—indebted for the idea to Switzerland, 89—danger of misapplication, 92—Mr. Guthrie indelibly associated with, 93.

Railway system of Great Britain, 569—magnificence of public works in Great Britain, 571—invention of railways of slow growth, 571—early history, 572—Liverpool and Manchester, 574—Birmingham and London, 575—panic of 1845—increased by the revolutionary movement in 1848, 576—effects of the panic, 576—statement of Railway Commissioners—nature and extent of traffic, 577—increasing receipts, 579—amount expended in construction, 579—Audit of Accounts' Bill, 580—amalgamation, 581—comparative expense of British and foreign railways, 582—taxes, 589—colonial railways, 589—future prospects of railway property, 590—pro-

- bable increased value of, 592—necessity of completing the railway system, 595—errors and duties of the Government, 597—description of a railway and its appendage, 598—magnificent railway structures, 600—salubrity of tunnels—Kilshy tunnel, 601—expense of cuttings, 603—viaducts, 603—bridges, 604—communication between London and Dublin, 605—Conway tubular bridge, 606—the power by which the railway is to be worked, 608—atmospheric power, 609—rate of travelling, 610—increasing safety of steam navigation—contrast of risk in railway travelling, between England and Germany, France, Belgium, 613—return of accidents in Great Britain and Ireland, 613—causes of railway accidents, 614—encouragement and advice to railway proprietors, 616.
- Rationalism, 37—logical and intuitional consciousness, 43.
- Reason, use and abuse of, 41.
- Registration Bill, 275—principle of, 276—its machinery—simple and complex, 278—special objections, 279—present system, 279—church machinery unfitted for the object of, 281—true objects of, 283—result of the operation of the English, 285—statistics, 285.
- Religion, peculiar essence of, by Mr. Mott 9—exposition of natural and revealed, 326.
- Restauration des Sciences Philosophiques, par Vincent Goubert, 369. See Goubert.
- Revelation, not the mission of Divine teachers, 24—God speaking to man, 25—not merely a subjective influence, 31—an objective discovery of truth, 33—not primarily intuitional—use of reason in dealing with, 39.
- Rich, Mr., examines the ruins of Babylon, 211—slight notice of ruins of Nineveh, 212—examines the area of Nineveh, 213.
- S
- St. Paul, voyage and shipwreck of, 188—most interesting portion of apostolic record, 191—narrative investigated, 193—peculiarities in the style of the historian, 196—illustrated by reference to the journal of a medical officer in Captain Cook's ship, 197—confirmed by present nautical experiences, 199.
- Scott, David, R.S.A.—demeanour of—his native city—general estimation of his character and talents, 133—birth and parentage, 135—early avocations, 136—dedication to art, 138—early melancholy, 140—expansive energy, 143—visits Paris, Parma, and Rome, 144—colossal picture of Family Discord, 145—series of pictures of historical character, &c., 146—*Yaseo de Gama*, 149—essays on art, 149—their peculiar style, 150—his conversion—visit from the English Opium
- Eater, 151—manners, 152—rigour and friendship, 153—theology and religion, 154—final malady, 155—body and soul, 156.
- Scottish character, 441—ecclesiastical polity, central principle of, 449.
- Scottish Covenanters, explanation of their conduct, 441.
- Sikh Empire, fall of, 618—object of re-establishment of the Sikh government, 619—wuzeerat of Lal Singh—his character, 620—outbreak in Cashmere, 621—deposition of Lal Singh, 623—reconstruction of the Lahore government, 625—false appearances of tranquillity, 627—measures of internal administration, 627—improving appearances, 628—advantages of British influence, 629—removal of the Maharane, 631—the Dusserah festival, 633—Lord Hardinge and Colonel Lawrence leave for England, 633—Lord Hardinge's policy, 633—Dewan of Mooltan assassinated, and his son succeeds, 631—convulsions begin to rend the country, 634—Moolraj resigns, 635—attack upon the British officers at Mooltan—arab troops in insurrection, 636—position of Moolraj, 637—critical situation of the Resident, 638—determination of the Commander-in-Chief, 639—approved by the Governor-General in council, 639—conspiracy by the Maharane and others, 640—consequences of delay, 640—Lieutenant Edwardes, 641—his movements and magnanimous determination, 643—General Courtlandt's troops effect a junction with Edwardes, 643—they act on the offensive, 644—Edwardes leads a successful attack upon the rebels at Soojabad, 645—preparations for reducing Mooltan—Moolraj loses confidence; precipitately leaves the field with his army, 646—a few miles from Mooltan, Edwardes writes for supplies, 647—conspirators executed, 647—a revolt suppressed, 648—Edwardes in vain reiterates his application for supplies, 649—Sir F. Currie takes the responsibility of ordering troops with a powerful siege-train, 649—uncertain state of the native troops, 650—arrival of troops at Mooltan under General Whish—the garrison besieged, 652—the Sikh force joins the enemy, 653—the siege raised, 654—the war assumes a new character, 654—state of matters in the Hazareh country, 654—Moolraj at Mooltan—the British army marches for the Punjab—Lord Gough joins the army—the troops retire dispirited, 656—General Thackwell's unsuccessful attempt to cross the Chenab, 657—sanguinary engagement with the Sikhs, 657—the city and fortress of Mooltan carried by General Whish, 658—he marches to join the grand army under Lord Gough—Sikhs and Afghans

- unite, 659—the triumph of the British, 660—fall of the sovereignty of the Sikhs, 660.
- Slave-Trade Policy of Britain, suggestions for judging of, 457—league to prevent slave importation into Brazil—causes of demand there, 459—the annual supply, 461—our custom-house and slave-trade policy compared, 463—inefficacy of our present policy, 465—origin of African slavery, 467—cheapness of slave labour considered, 468—statement of Mr. McCulloch, 471—the hope of Africa, 473—conclusion of the last Report of the Select Committee, 474.
- Slavonians and Eastern Europe, 528—chief races of the world, 529—probability of a Slavonian era, 531—ancient Slavonians, 533—primitive threefold division of, 534—result of this division, 535—consequences of the division of the empire of the Cæsars, 535—early Slavonian history, 537—introduction of Christianity, 539—German encroachments, 541—Tatar invasions, 542—the Turks, 545—genius of the Slavonians developed by their sifting, 546—their industrial character, 546—language and literature, 548—heroism, 550—Polish history, 551—present state of the Slavonic race, 553—probability of a speedy change in their condition, 553—Panslavic theory, 554—Illyrian movement, 556—accordance between the two, 557—intermediate scheme of a Slavonic Austria, 558—fleet of French revolution in Germany, 559—Hungary and the Magyars, 560—Austria, Hungary, and the Croats, 563—insurrection in Vienna, 566—present perplexed aspect of matters, 568.
- Smith, James, Esq., Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 188—fitness of the author for his task, 194.
- Steam navigation, increasing safety of, 612.
- Stella's childhood, 311—prevailed on by Dean Swift to invest her money in Irish funds, 347—friendship with the Dean, 350—her coffin found, 362.
- Sun, increase of cold the nearer we approach to, 95.
- Sutherlandshire, tour in, 95—Switzerland and Scotland, 97—comfortable accommodation, 99—mode and state of agriculture, 100—Inch-na-damff and Loch Assynt, 101—Glencul and Glendhu—Loch Laxford, 102—Loch Eribol to Tongue, 103—mode of travelling, 104—death of the osprey, 105—osprey's nest, 107—castle of Ardrack, 109—species of birds, 110—black-throated diver, 111—the Duke's deer-forest, 113—trout, 114—salmon not exciseable, 115—Mr. Young on salmon, 117—Loch Shin, abounding in curlews, golden plovers, &c., 118—red-necked phalarope, 119—duck-shooting, 121—attachment in a male pochard, 122—death of a wild swan, 123—combat with a wounded swan, 125—pursuit of an otter, 126—dukes and drakes, 127—narrow escape, 129—roe-buck & the Free Church—herring fishery and the picturesque, 131.
- Swift, Dean, closing scenes of his life, by Mr. Wilde—recollections of Stella revived—disease of which the Dean died, 337—his biographers, 338—Johnson's notice of, 339—an Englishman, born in Ireland, 339—letters between Pope and Swift, 340—at the university, 341—supported by his uncle, 342—at Sir W. Temple's, 343—becomes acquainted with Stella, 343—commencement of cerebral disease, 344—is offered a place in the Rolls in Dublin, by Temple, but prefers the Church—obtains a living, 345—Sheridan's and Scott's account of his resigning, 345—acquaintance with King William, 346—edits Sir William Temple's works, 347—imports two ladies—at Laracor—gossip, 347—love stories, 348—nature of the affection between Swift and Stella, 350—Tale of a Tub, 350—Gulliver's Travels, 351—Journal to Stella, 352—correspondence with the fair sex, 353—intimacy with the Van Homrighs, 353—Vanessa, 354—causes which saved him from marriage, 355—Hawkesworth, 356—marriage with Stella improbable, 357—supposed evidence, and Mr. Mason's examination of it, 357—to be regretted that he did not marry, 359—cheerless days, 359—splenetic epistles, 360—political life, 361—bust, 362—coffins of Swift and Stella exposed, 362—portrait of Stella, 363—destination of her property, 363—monument to her memory, 364—early habits and benevolent exertions of Swift, 365—"Scott's Life of Swift," 365—circumstances under which he received his Dublin degree, 366—his conscientious exercise of patronage, 366—his economical habits, 367—best editions of his works, 367—his ministrations as a clergyman, 367—Pope's feeling regarding him, 368.
- Switzerland, its diversified and natural beauties, 97.
- Systematic theology, Morell's views on, 293.

T

- Temple, Sir William, his attachment to Dean Swift, 343—offers Swift a place in the Rolls in Dublin, 345.
- Ten Years' Conflict, by Dr. Robert Buchanan—feeling of the British public as to the recent ecclesiastical conflict, 436—past conduct of British Statesmen in regard to stirring events, 436—the most favourable position for contemplating, 437—character and position of the Scottish Reformers, 437—Scottish character and principles—spiritual independence,

- 439—views of Erskine and Melville, 440—Scottish covenanters, 441—Scottish character, 441—position from which to view parties, 443—"two kings and two kingdoms"—Revolution of 1688, 445—restoration of patronage, 446—first aspect of the Conflict, 447—advances, 448—central principle of Scottish ecclesiastical polity, 449—general importance of that principle, 451—fame of the act of Disruption, 451—question, as to the effect of *mere separation*, 452—character of Dr. Buchanan's work, 453.
- Vaughan, Henry, the Silurist, 44—his birth-place and parentage, 48—his associates, 49—his poems, 50.
- Vienna, insurrection at, 566.

W

- Wilde, Mr., Editor of Dublin Medical Journal, 337—recovers genuine portrait of Stella, 363.
- Writers de re Poetica, 44.

